

JONAS HANWAY

1712—1786

BY

JOHN H. HUTCHINS

LONDON

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.G. 2
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1940

TO ELOISE

Made in Great Britain

CONTENTS

Chap.		Page
	INTRODUCTION 	ix.
I.	JONAS HANWAY 	I
II.	THE FOUNDLING HOSPITAL 	16
III.	THE WORKHOUSE 	47
IV.	THE MARINE SOCIETY 	77
V.	THE MAGDALEN HOUSE 	109
VI.	THE WORTHY POOR 	133
VII.	THE STURDY BEGGAR 	160
VIII.	THE CITIZEN OF LONDON 	170
IX.	CONCLUSION 	184
	BIBLIOGRAPHY 	188
	INDEX 	195

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

PORTRAIT OF HANWAY	<i>Frontispiece</i>
CAPTAIN THOMAS CORAM	Facing page 18
TIMES OF THE DAY—NIGHT	55
INDUSTRY AND IDLENESS—PLATE V	78
PORTRAIT OF JOHN THORNTON	107
GIN LANE	120
INDUSTRY AND IDLENESS—PLATE XI	161
THE MARCH TO FINCHLEY	180

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

IN writing this book I have received assistance and advice which it is a pleasure to acknowledge. At Columbia University Professor Ernest Hunter Wright first suggested the subject and read the manuscript in its various stages. Any student who has worked with Professor Harry Morgan Ayres will understand my difficulty in expressing the gratitude I feel for his scholarly wisdom and kindly encouragement. I appreciate also the helpful comments of Professors H. N. Fairchild, George Sherburn, Suzanne Nobbe, Horace Taylor and Dr. George Nobbe. Thanks are due to my colleagues, Professors Joseph L. Tynan and Jarvis Keiley, for reading parts of the manuscript and for listening to me as I puzzled over problems of interpretation. Professor Rupert Taylor of Clemson College read carefully the entire book and gave me the benefit of his learning and experience, and Professor Ford K. Brown of St. John's College encouraged me to believe that I have not exaggerated the number or the importance of philanthropic societies. In London I received unfailing help from Captain H. T. A. Bosanquet, R.N., C.V.O., and the officers of the Marine Society; from Mr. R. H. Nichols of the Foundling Hospital; and from the Rev. J. A. Stiff of the Magdalen Hospital. The officers of the British Museum and those of the Columbia and New York Public libraries assisted me in finding books and papers which I had reason to fear were lost for ever.

J.H.H.

The City College, New York,
June 8th, 1939.

INTRODUCTION

I

ON August 7th, 1938 the *New York Times* related that an old umbrella had recently been sold in a London auction room. The umbrella had belonged to Jonas Hanway who, retiring from business in 1750, wrote over seventy books and pamphlets expressing his solicitude for human misfortune. He was the first Englishman to use this simple protection but, enduringly symbolic though it may be of Hanway—and of many an Englishman since, going about trying to do good because it seemed the sensible thing to do—we may at once dismiss the umbrella and consider those seventy volumes and the manifold charities through which their author hoped to make a better world for everybody, for the rich as well as for the poor. A study of these writings and the institutions they helped to shape may throw some light on the beginnings of social attitudes and efforts which later grew to importance, may bring shades and shadows into sharper relief, and thus reveal more distinctly the eighteenth century society and literature justly regarded as polite.

For beneath the surface of eighteenth century literature with its emphasis on common sense, order and reason, one finds constant reference to ways of thinking and living that stand in grim contrast to the wit and polish of drawing-room and coffee-house. Long before the Fieldings instituted reform at Bow Street, Swift wrote of beggars and thieves who gathered around shop doors,¹ and Defoe of able-bodied men who refused to work because they could gain more by begging and petty thievery.² In the *Spectator* Addison remarked upon old soldiers who excited pity by displaying real or pretended wounds and upon nurses who callously allowed children to die under their care. In the reign of Queen Anne the chances were three to one that a child would die before it was five

¹ *Proposal for Giving Badges to Beggars* (n.d.) and *Sermons*, *passim*.

² *Giving Alms No Charity* (1704).

years of age; the Queen buried eleven of her own offspring. For poverty-stricken parents to desert their infants was common, and dead bodies were not uncommonly left in the streets to be disposed of by the parish. Prostitutes spread disease and robbed the drunken and unwary. As late as 1750 Horace Walpole watched a highwayman stop a coach in Piccadilly and ride down a pedestrian in making his escape.

Because men and women of the eighteenth century were sensible and orderly, they faced these conditions with neither indifference nor hopelessness. England did not have to wait for Dickens to arouse pity and get something done for the unfortunate. The age was one of charity and increasing supervision of the poor. Men set about re-examining the means toward a better social order, since it was apparent that the old ways grew less and less effective. In fact, no system of caring for the indigent had proved successful in the past. In 1601 Burghley had revised and codified the existing laws but, justly famous as his Act had been, it was constantly revised and amplified during the seventeenth century.³ Because citizens realized that their own well-being and safety were endangered by numbers of idle roisterers, they evolved various plans to secure good order and to force everyone to earn his own living. As the writers considered the facts, they came to divergent conclusions, but literally hundreds of books and pamphlets bear witness to interest in measures of social reform.

In the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries generous individuals dispensed charity in response to personal appeals. With this assistance a benefactor like Matthew Bramble or Harry Clinton expected the indigent to work themselves into a position of independence. But as the number of mendicants increased, after 1700 a belief grew that spontaneous giving to the poor added to the misery it was meant to alleviate, not only

³ For the history of the Poor Laws and attempts at relief see Sir Frederic Morton Eden, *The State of the Poor* (1797); Dorothy Marshall, *The English Poor in the Eighteenth Century* (1926); Richard Burn, *Observations on the Poor Laws* (1764); George Unwin, *Industrial Organization in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (1904); R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (1926); and Ephraim Lipson, *The Economic History of England* (1923-31).

by making the pauper a chronic beggar but also by attracting others to the same means of livelihood. Few beggars seemed to use the help they received to their permanent advantage. Philanthropists generally felt that charity must take another course in the future.

Many citizens came to believe that all assistance given to the indigent should cease and that men should cultivate an iron resistance to pleas of misfortune. Thus mendicants would be forced to rely on their own strength, to care for their own children, and to provide for their own old age. Realizing that some people were incapable of such independence, Bishop Berkeley suggested that these should be enslaved to the public and work under the direction of overseers. Defoe was of much the same opinion, for he wrote that there was enough work to be done to keep every industrious person employed, adding :

Truly the scandal of begging lies on our charity; and people have such a notion in England of being pitiful and charitable that they encourage vagrants, and by a mistaken zeal do more harm than good.⁴

A half century later Smollett commented that public hospitals

. . . instead of diminishing the taxes for the maintenance of the poor, encouraged the vulgar to be idle and dissolute, by opening an asylum to them and their families, from the diseases of poverty and intemperance. For it remains to be proved, that the parish rates are decreased, the bills of mortality lessened, the people more numerous, or the streets less infested with beggars, notwithstanding the immense sums yearly granted by individuals for the relief of the indigent.⁵

In 1760 when Charles Johnstone in his satire sent Chrysal his personification of a guinea to the annual feast of an unnamed charity, Chrysal observed little loving kindness in the hearts of the governors. To them philanthropy was a means "to bribe heaven with the wages of hell"; no pros-

⁴ *Giving Alms No Charity.*

⁵ *Ferdinand, Count Fa'hom*, Ch. LII.

pective donor would be encouraged by Chrysal's comments on those relieving the poor.⁶ Both Smollett and Johnstone reveal opinions held by a good part of the reading public.

Other men, notably Firman, Cary and Robert Nelson, drew almost the opposite conclusion.⁷ They agreed that a casual gift did no good, for the relief met only an immediate need and did not provide a means through which the pauper could become self-supporting. They argued that for this reason the poor man was not entirely to blame for continuing his appeals. They therefore suggested that the sensible procedure was to supply a place where the unemployed could live, and to maintain them there while they worked on materials provided by the parish. By this plan the poor were to receive the full value of their labour, when the finished goods, probably cloth, were sold; each man could then repay whatever the parish had advanced to him and have a profit to invest on a new project. Another advantage urged in support of this method was that workmen would be free of the rapacious dealers who lowered prices for labour whenever they had stock on hand. When Firman tried this plan at Bristol and published his *Account of the Workhouse* (1699) to prove his success, men in other parishes speedily followed his example. In 1722 Parliament provided that any parish desiring to do so might establish a workhouse for its poor. Theoretically the problem of poor relief was solved.

Practically, however, as Defoe was one of the first to realize, the workhouse could not succeed for any length of time. If weavers were efficient enough to earn their living and if there was a profitable market for their cloth, they had no need of assistance anywhere. As workhouses began to end the year with deficits overseers drove their charges to greater effort and thus destroyed both the independence and the ambition of those whom they were trying to rehabilitate. Another handicap arose from the lack of public buildings and eleemosynary institutions. The workhouse became the most convenient place for the overseer of the poor to send the parish lunatics,

⁶ *Chrysal*, Ch. XXXI.

⁷ Richard Burn, *Observations on the Poor Laws*, *passim*.

orphans, foundlings and needy pregnant women. It also served as a house of correction for those guilty of offences such as vagrancy, prostitution and disorderly conduct. The workhouse, in other words, became a "catchall" for the parish misfits.

Gradually men began to distinguish between these various functions of the workhouse. At first the only line drawn was that between the worthy poor, who were to be aided, and the sturdy beggars, who were to be disciplined. Later the worthy poor were divided into groups of those who were still able to work for their own support and of those who were too young, too old or infirm. When men began to consider the poor in terms of the individual pauper's needs, public-spirited citizens began to form groups or societies, each limited to a particular form of aid. Robert Nelson, for example, in publishing *An Address to Persons of Quality and Estate* (1715) suggested that wealthy people should establish various charities, such as a foundling hospital, a house for repentant prostitutes, and a school for wayward children. He realized that most depredations of the poor grew out of their misery. Years later, in his *Proposal for Making an Effectual Provision for the Poor, for Amending their Morals, and for rendering them Useful Members of Society* (1753), Henry Fielding sympathetically observed, "They starve, and freeze, and rot among themselves; but they beg, steal and rob among their betters." By this time intelligent men perceived that the impetuous gift of an individual was likely to serve no useful purpose, that it was likely to corrupt the character of the recipient, and that charity needed to become both permanent and methodical.

Throughout the eighteenth century some of the men most active in work for the benefit of the poor had been or still were successful in business. Naturally they carried into any new enterprise their principles and methods, including the use of the joint-stock company in developing any plan beyond the means of an individual. Charity was obviously just such a project, and company organization was adapted to its needs.

The hundreds of charitable groups which were formed

during the eighteenth century followed a common line of development. Some man, a "projector," had a specific plan of reform which he believed practicable. He discussed the idea with his friends, enlisting their sympathy and aid. The group then approached a well-known man, usually of the nobility, with the request that he serve as honorary chairman in order that they might use his name in soliciting funds. They would elect an executive chairman, rent office space, and hire one or two clerks and a porter. Everyone connected with the society used every opportunity to get money to prosecute the work. As soon as their charity had shown its usefulness, the results were advertised zealously to secure new support.

The most valuable of the members, or governors, was the man who could best explain the activities to the greatest number of people, the man who could write pamphlets and articles for the newspapers. If this man was widely known as a practical philanthropist who lent his aid only to those enterprises which were indubitably successful, who would criticize and meet criticism, he might attract a following among serious citizens and draw to the coffers of a charity hundreds of pounds, simply because he approved of it. Men who had amassed large fortunes were willing to expend part of their income on good works, but they wanted to be sure their money was spent wisely. Thus, in seeking funds, institutions like the Foundling Hospital, established by Coram in 1739, published their achievements. Others—the Magdalen House, the Marine Society—had been projected but were not founded before 1750. The conditions were present that marked all these charities as inevitable.

Here lay the call to Hanway's unemployed abilities and energies. His unquestioned honesty, his intimate knowledge of the problems of the poor, and his wide experience with the administration of charitable organizations gave him a position almost unique in Georgian London. His pamphlets were effective because they revealed the achievements and the needs of organized philanthropy as well as society's probable benefits.

II

In considering the eighteenth century's great energies in developing societies for the betterment of the poor, one is faced with a seeming paradox, which is as surprising to-day as it was a cause for annoyance then. On the one hand was an almost continual demand for more labourers, which caused all sorts of men, ranging from Jeremy Bentham to the humblest pamphleteers, to propose schemes for increasing the population. On the other was the painful fact that every year parishes spent more money to support the poor, the number of organizations devoted to poor relief multiplied, and the sums these spent increased daily. Approximations though they be, the following figures may clarify the problem of society. The population doubled during the century.⁸ The woollen cloth industry tripled between 1688 and 1760, and the national income rose from £43,500,000 in 1688⁹ to £119,500,000 in 1770,¹⁰ and to £430,000,000 in 1812.¹¹ The cost of living was comparatively stable until 1760—e.g. Middlesex in 1686 estimated the cost of supporting a child for one year at £7 16s., and Parliament appropriated £7 10s. from 1756 to 1760 for each child in the Foundling Hospital. After 1760 food prices rose rapidly and merchants and manufacturers racked their brains to discover ways in which their workmen could live more cheaply. Although there was a fairly constant demand for labour, contemporary publications have many versions of the story that Defoe offered a strolling beggar work at 9s. a week, only to be refused because the mendicant believed he could gain more by casual entreaties.¹² Such experiences would not temper the wrath of the rate-paying citizen, and the fact that employers needed workmen seemed to justify the common view of poverty as meriting scorn.

Yet life in the eighteenth century was perhaps more uncer-

⁸ No census was taken until 1801. For this reason, the accuracy of figures regarding population, employment, income and prices before this date is always doubtful. I have tried to present the estimates of responsible persons, those which are generally accepted.

⁹ Gregory King, *Natural and Political Observations* (1694).

¹⁰ Arthur Young, *Tour Through the North of England* (1771), IV, 393.

¹¹ Patrick Colquhoun, *Resources of the British Empire* (1814).

¹² *Giving Alms No Charity.*

tain, and both employment and wealth shifted more rapidly than in any previous comparable period in modern English history. Rapid shifts in the means by which men earned their living made it necessary that workmen be trained to make the best use of their time. In 1688 most of the population derived its income from agriculture, many adding a few shillings by weaving in their spare time. In 1770 Arthur Young estimated an even division of employment between agriculture and industry; by 1811 the rural population had dropped to 35 per cent of the population. When Matthew Bramble revisited London he was amazed at the city's rapid growth:

What I left open fields, producing hay and corn, I now find covered with streets and squares, and palaces and churches. I am credibly informed, that, in the space of seven years, eleven thousand new houses have been built in one quarter of Westminster, exclusive of what is daily added to other parts of this unwieldy metropolis.¹³

And Walpole wrote to Sir Thomas Mann: "You would not know your country again. You left it a private little island living upon its means. You would find it the capital of the world."¹⁴ Manufacturers built their mills in the Midlands, and the centre of population moved northward from the farm lands of the south. Thousands of men whose families had resided in their parishes for generations suddenly moved to another part of the country to work in new employments. Matthew Bramble was not the only one to feel disturbed at the disruption of manners, the hurry and change of the new age.

While the peasant probably moved to the city because he could (or thought he could) earn a better livelihood there, his departure was an advantage both to the landowner and to the manufacturer, a discovery the poets and novelists were slow to make. Writers upheld the traditional relationship of lord and retainer. Parson Adams was angry that no complaint could be made successfully against the wealthy young squire when he shot the Wilson spaniel:

¹³ *Humphry Clinker*, Letter to Dr. Lewis, London, May 29th.

¹⁴ Horace Walpole, *Letters*, ed. Mrs. Paget Toynbee (1903-5).

. . . he was as absolute as any tyrant in the universe, and had killed all the dogs and taken away all the guns in the neighbourhood; and not only that but he trampled down hedges and rode over corn and gardens with no more regard than if they were the highway.¹⁵

Matthew Bramble commented that the squires could get few labourers now that everyone was moving to the city. Goldsmith, however, was not wholly right when he wrote:

One only master grasps the whole domain,
And half a tillage stints thy smiling plain;

because the landowners were stressing scientific agriculture in order to produce enough food for the doubling population. This they could not do under the old system of small units and much common land, so they evicted their tenants and enclosed the common. The prevailing economic theory was that the country should be self-supporting, sell its surplus abroad, and bring home gold and silver to insure its defence in time of war. Because transportation was slow, difficult and expensive, the squires could charge high prices and grow wealthy; on this landed aristocracy Jane Austen based her novels.

In the course of a hundred years most of the workmen adjusted themselves to urban living and to shifting from place to place with the demand for labour. Parishes sent the able-bodied inmates of their workhouses in groups of fifty to five hundred to the sparsely settled Midlands; independent workmen combined to rove from town to town. These migrants had no roots in any community and might or might not feel bound by duty, responsibility or honesty. During the February preceding the production of the *Beggar's Opera* robbery and violence rose to such a height that the government was forced to stern measures. George II issued a proclamation offering a reward of £100 to an informant on the conviction of anyone who had committed murder or robbery by force and violence in the open street, highway or road in London and Westminster, or within five miles thereof. Under George III a reward of £40 was offered. Either sum

¹⁵ *Joseph Andrews*, Book III, Ch. IV.

was large, life was cheap, and from the beginning the Jonathan Wilds availed themselves of the opportunity to profit from false "informations" against the wanderer. The man who swore to the guilt of Humphry Clinker for the sake of the reward, was himself detected in robbery a few days later. Johnstone, in *Chrysal*, satirized a Justice for conniving with a gang to encourage persons to crime in order that he might profit from getting them hanged. In real life Fielding's plain-clothes men destroyed a gang of such informants; five men were found to have made £960 before they were detected.¹⁶ Though their victims had been executed, the five could only be punished for perjury; the mob killed one of them in the pillory. Johnson did not exaggerate the dangers of London:

Here malice, rapine, accident, conspire,
And now a rabble rages, now a fire;
Their ambush here relentless ruffians lay,
And here the fell attorney prowls for prey.

Until the constantly shifting population could be stabilized, until men could be educated to be sober, responsible and content, danger was ever present. Misery made men eager to riot with Wilkes and Gordon, or to go to war with the Pretender. In the country their well-being had depended on the squire's good opinion; in the city they were foot-loose. Although the manufacturer usually lived and worked with his men, the men could change jobs with little loss. In his *History of England* Macaulay recorded the fact that within a few squares of where Somers was studying law there were streets no officer dared enter without a company of soldiers at his back. This had been true when Shadwell wrote the *Squire of Alsatia*, and it remained true throughout Hanway's lifetime. Henry Fielding expressed part of the problem of law enforcement in his *Inquiry*:

In the parish of St. Giles there are a great number of these houses set apart for the reception of idle persons and vagabonds who have their lodgings there for twopence a

¹⁶ W. E. H. Lecky, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century* (1883), III, 135.

night: That in the above parish and in St. George, Bloomsbury, one woman alone occupies seven of these houses all properly accommodated from the cellar to the garret for such twopenny lodgers: That in these beds, several of which are in the same room, men and women, often strangers to each other, lie promiscuously, the price of a double bed being no more than threepence as an encouragement to them to lie together: That as these places are adapted to whoredom, so they are no less provided for drunkenness, gin being sold in them all at a penny a quartern; so that the smallest sum of money serves for intoxication: That in the execution of search warrants, Mr. Welch rarely finds less than twenty of these houses open for the receipt of all comers at the latest hours.¹⁷

When Fielding went to Bow Street as magistrate, men known to be thieves and murderers walked the streets with little danger of interference.

During the century a great effort was made to keep wages and the cost of production low in order that English merchants might dominate world trade. The progress of the French was watched anxiously. Since the great expansion of industry came at a time when there was also a flourishing slave trade, it was perhaps inevitable that labour at home as well as abroad must come to be regarded as a commodity to be bought and sold.

What happened at the Industrial Revolution was that all the restraints that the law imposed upon workmen in particular industries, were standardized into a general law for the whole of the expanding world of industry, and all the regulations and laws that recognized him as a person with rights were withdrawn or became inoperative.¹⁸

To defend the national trade, Parliament passed the Combination Acts of 1719, which forbade the labourer to take his skill and ingenuity to another country. As a skilled mechanic Watt thought of going to Russia; as a manufacturer of steam engines he rushed up to London and warned all ports to

¹⁷ Henry Fielding, *Inquiry into the Cause of the Great Increase in Robbers* (1751), 92.

¹⁸ Barbara and J. L. Hammond, *The Rise of Modern Industry* (1927), 206.

prevent his employees from emigrating. Hanway counselled apprentices :

One of the greatest crimes in your rank of life is when artificers or mechanics first do mischief at home, and then go over to other countries and teach the people who are or may become our enemies, those arts by which we live and prosper. This is like stabbing your father, or plunging a dagger into your mother's breast.¹⁹

Should a fractious labourer join with others in an attempt to better his position, later Combination Acts enabled the employer to send them all to jail. The labourer was supposed to go to work and forget his troubles; the employers felt that they might properly settle social, economic and political problems.

Because of low wages both husband and wife had to work long hours in order to provide the bare necessities of food, clothes and shelter. In a *Report to the Board of Trade* in 1697 John Locke advised training children to work at the age of three; nevertheless even impoverished parents usually waited until the child was between six and ten. That the poor worked only for necessities and must be faced with immediate want before they would work at all was a common argument in favour of low wages. Concurrently, everyone recognized that the laggard and the hopeless needed a further incentive to industry. Sometimes sturdy beggars were sent to the parish workhouse to labour under the direction of an overseer who, to save parish funds, purposely made their lives so wretched that they would do anything, anywhere, at any wage, rather than submit to workhouse life. If workmen left their own parish, they must be self-supporting in the one to which they went or they could be returned, with a whipping in each parish. The Act of Settlement of 1662 (seemingly passed by accident) theoretically confined most of the population within the parish of their birth. It empowered any two justices to return to his parish within forty days a person who moved to

¹⁹ Hanway, *The Rules and Orders of the Stepney Society*: . . . also *Moral and Prudential Instructions, Given to the Apprentices Placed Out to Marine Trades* (1759), 37; hereafter referred to as *Moral and Prudential Instructions*.

another and there occupied a house with an annual rental under ten pounds. The importance of the Act has been exaggerated; it enabled a parish to rid itself of new inhabitants who might prove undesirable, but in practice the method was little used. (Thus Fielding revealed Lady Booby's desperation when she invoked the Act to prevent Joseph from marrying Fanny under the charge that the union would "increase the numbers of the poor.") The officers preferred to use the law only as a threat, because they found it cheaper to give temporary aid, terming the recipients "casuals." If a man settled in a parish was literally unable to earn enough for his necessities or if he had more children than the family could support the overseer of the poor either assisted the family or took one or two children to the workhouse. Each year a larger number needed help. In 1783²⁰ Hanway estimated the number of paupers in the kingdom at 170,000 to 200,000 or one person in every thirty-two.

A modern reader of eighteenth century literature should remember that the average man was not then fully a citizen. He did not vote; he did not own property; important decisions were made for him, much as they had been in medieval times. His religious state was a matter of grave concern, however, for he had a soul, and his salvation was important. Within limits he could choose his employer. He might save money and become an employer himself. If he was goaded beyond endurance, he could steal, riot, burn and murder—many did. Everyone believed that the true wealth of the kingdom lay in the numbers of the labouring poor. Whether these became the support or the destruction of society depended upon how well they adjusted themselves to life in the city and in the mill; they must develop *mores* to replace those they had discarded and substitute some other equally effective supervision for that of the country squire. Therefore, it would be remarkable if responsible society in the

²⁰ Hanway, *Abstract of the Proposal for County Naval Free Schools To Be Built on Waste Lands, Giving Such Effectual Instruction to Poor Boys as May Nurse Them for the Sea Service, Teaching Them also to Cultivate the Earth* (1783), xxxvi-vii; hereafter referred to as *Abstract for County Naval Free Schools*.

century had not become widely and vitally interested in charity. Perhaps the work of the religious philanthropists led to greater stability among the poor: the French Revolution was not followed by one in England.

Through their organizations the wealthy relieved misery and taught religious principles to the poor. In developing these charitable organizations between 1750 and 1786, Jonas Hanway was perhaps the most active man in London. He was, however, only one among dozens who were devoting their time and energy to saving life and making it possible for the indigent to survive.

* * * * *

The title page to one of Hanway's volumes is practically an outline of the book; the full titles are too long for repeated quotation. On my first reference to a pamphlet, therefore, I have cited it in a way which will enable the reader to find the whole in the bibliography, and stated the shortened title in succeeding references. Unless otherwise noted, all books referred to were published in London.

The *Dictionary of National Biography* credits Hanway with seventy-four volumes, several of which I have been unable to find. Those I have read vary in length between forty and one thousand pages. Because Hanway constantly repeated arguments which he believed his readers should consider, it seems probable that the rediscovery of the missing pamphlets would add little to what can now be known. Furthermore Hanway often made minor alterations in his didactic books and reissued them for other charitable organizations with which he was working. In the text I try to give the date of original publication; in footnotes and bibliography, the date of the volume I have read.

Primarily I have attempted to present Hanway's story as he presented it to the London public. Other books are quoted only to clarify a point at issue or to demonstrate that Hanway's thinking was representative of his age. The number of these references might, of course, have been increased *ad infinitum*.

CHAPTER I

JONAS HANWAY

A BRIEF biography of Jonas Hanway may facilitate an understanding of the work in which he engaged as an individual and that in which he was the spokesman for various charitable societies. He was born in 1712, probably on August 2nd,¹ and he died on September 5th, 1786. He was the third child and the eldest surviving son of Thomas Hanway, a commissioner of the dockyard at Portsmouth in charge of naval stores. When Thomas Hanway was killed by a fall from his horse in 1714 the widow brought her four children to a suburb of London in order that they might receive such schooling as she was able to afford. Jonas, at least, learned to read Latin after a fashion, to keep accounts, and to appreciate the endless stream of tracts and sermons with which members of religious families entertained themselves in their hours of relaxation.

Even as a small boy Hanway judged both his books and his friends with reference to their effect upon his own morals. In regard to one of his youthful associates, he came to write :

Though deficient in scholastic learning, he had no taste for trifling books; Locke, Clarke, political tracts, and our best poets were his delight. I have sat with him many an hour on the bank of a rivulet, with Milton, Addison, and Pope. Rowe and Otway were also our companions sometimes, for Shakespeare had not reached our knowledge in the obscurity of a little country school.²

This seems heavy reading for two youths in their early teens, but it may not then have been unusual. From the time he

¹ John Pugh, *Remarkable Occurrences in the Life of Jonas Hanway, Esq.* (1787), hereafter referred to as *Life*, gives the date as either the second or the twelfth, then assumes it to have been the twelfth. Perhaps he saw a document in which the figure was blurred. The parish register at Portsmouth states that "Jonas Hanaway" was baptized on August 9th, 1712.

² Hanway, *Reflections, Essays and Meditations on Life and Religion* (1761), I, 132; hereafter referred to as *Reflections and Essays*.

could read and write Hanway kept commonplace books and wrote detailed journals of the happenings of the day and his thoughts about them. Some of this material he published in 1761 as his *Reflections, Essays and Meditations on Life and Religion*; his journals from 1743 to 1750 formed the basis for his once famous *Historical Account of the British Trade over the Caspian Sea: With a Journal of Travels from London through Russia into Persia: and back again through Russia, Germany and Holland* (1753).³

Perhaps because the father had been an officer of the Navy, the children turned naturally toward it as a means of livelihood. Thomas was apprenticed aboard ship, retiring in 1771 as commissioner of the dockyard at Chatham. William went into the Navy Office. The sister, Elizabeth, married first a Captain Worledge and, later, a Mr. Townsend. Jonas, however, was apprenticed to a merchant at Lisbon when he was seventeen.

Hanway completed his apprenticeship in Lisbon, then set himself up as a merchant of the Turkey Company in Portugal, where he planned to remain for the rest of his life. When the lady of his choice married another, however, he sold out his business and returned to London. His romantic admiration for marital bliss seems to have been increased by this episode, but he was convinced that he himself should never wed. Years later, when the lady came to London, the two families are supposed to have been close friends.⁴

Meanwhile, in the early 'forties, Hanway spent some time at London "in commerce," and then bought a partnership with Charles Dingley, a merchant of the Russia Company, trading out of St. Petersburg. With the benefit of his experience in foreign trade Hanway must have set out for that city with high hopes, for in the eighteenth century Englishmen knew Russia as an undeveloped land of promise where many enterprising young men went to make their fortunes. Some of these achieved considerable success by introducing Western manufactures and methods of trade.

³ Hereafter referred to as *Account of the British Trade*.

⁴ Pugh, *Life*, 7.

When Hanway arrived at St. Petersburg in June 1743, he found the merchants of the Company in difficulties and on the verge of having their charter revoked by the irate Catherine. One Elton, who had lived in the region of the Caspian for some years, had interested the merchants in trading for the raw silk there and had induced them to appoint him as agent in charge. Shortly thereafter he seems to have become disgusted with the practices of some of his employers. Instead of diplomatically restraining himself to dealing in the goods of the Company in exchange for silk, he took a commission from the Shah of Persia to build a navy, probably for use against the Russians.⁵ At the demand of Catherine, the merchants commanded Elton to return to St. Petersburg, an order he perhaps could not, certainly did not, obey.

To save the trade of the Russia Company and to restore order in the affairs of the merchants, Hanway offered to take charge of a caravan of goods, thirty-seven bales of English cloth, and carry on trade beyond the Caspian Sea, at the same time attempting to restore good feeling among the traders, Catherine, and the Shah by quieting Elton and inducing him to return. Whether he was travelling by sled, wagon or boat his conveyance was likely to be so rudely constructed as to be a constant source of worry. His notes of the journey show both the country and its inhabitants little removed from primitive savagery. Once a peasant offered to sell his daughter as a slave, arguing that thus she would be fed, and the family enabled to pay taxes and live during the coming year. In the region of the Caspian, Hanway was instructed to cook his food by burning earth, for this would blaze indefinitely.

But Hanway had little time for the marvels along his way. Robbers lurked about his train; he had to maintain ceaseless vigilance to prevent being overwhelmed by their numbers. In Persia Elton saw no reason to give up his lucrative post with the Shah, despite Hanway's appeals to honour and warnings that the government was too unstable for safety. (Eventually Elton was killed.) Everything militated against

⁵ Pugh, *Life*, 11-13.

the success of the expedition. Finally rebels against the Shah confiscated Hanway's goods and left him friendless in a strange land.

Though disaster seemed complete, Hanway followed the course of his seized property on a decrepit, staggering nag and on foot. In constant danger of his life, he endured the hunger, cold and wet until, thoroughly exhausted, he could seek justice through an appeal to the self-interest of the Shah. The goods that remained were then restored to him, and after exchanging them for raw silk he was enabled to return with little actual loss of money. After an absence of one year and sixteen weeks, during which time he had journeyed about 5,400 miles, he finally returned to St. Petersburg. He had been convinced that trade with Persia by way of Russia was so hazardous as to be quite impracticable. Because of his escape from the dangers of the trip he took as a motto "Never Despair." In St. Petersburg he was very ill; perhaps he never recovered from the exposure and worry of this journey.

Before reaching St. Petersburg on his return journey Hanway had received a letter from England stating that a relative had died and left him enough money to enable him to retire from active business.⁶ Relieved of the necessity to trade, Hanway planned to return home immediately; but one disappointment followed another, and five years elapsed before he could depart. He does not say what these disappointments were; perhaps he was detained both by illness and by the difficulties of closing his business affairs.

In 1750 he made a leisurely journey by way of Germany and Holland to England. As he travelled from city to city he noted the business and customs of each place in order to determine whether or not the government was orderly and the opportunities for trade favourable. Everywhere he found representatives of the English Government and merchants

⁶ This year he received £765 from his mother, money which had been in the hands of his uncle, Major John Hanway. Jonas Hanway must have accumulated some property himself to be able to buy a partnership with Dingley. Perhaps he greatly increased his capital in the five years before he finally retired.

engaged in foreign trade eager to make his visit pleasant and instructive. In Berlin he attended a public "Carousal," which he considered to be idle dissipation. Here also he consulted Lieberkyn, physician to the King of Prussia, in regard to his health. Lieberkyn prescribed constant exercise and a diet of milk, suggestions which Hanway adopted, though for years the milk seemed to react unfavourably on his stomach. In Hamburg he renewed his acquaintance with Mr. Bosanquet, Mr. Thornton and Mr. Hickes, merchants with whom he had been previously associated. After several months of travel he arrived in London and went to live with his sister, Mrs. Townsend, in the Strand. In 1762 they moved to the house in Red Lion Square where they spent the rest of their lives.

From 1750 to January 1753 Hanway was busily engaged in writing and seeing through the press the *Account of the British Trade* which described his experiences and observations in Russia. Writing did not at first come easily, and in dedicating the second volume to Lady Elizabeth Germaine he expressed some doubt of the wisdom of his attempt: "The folly of writing, if it be one, is a folly I never shall commit again; and having taken this resolution, I have said all that I have to communicate to the public." He was, however, eager for this *summa* of his business experience to appear in the most favourable dress, and engaged good artists and engravers to prepare his maps and illustrations. The first edition of twelve hundred copies cost about £700.

As both Hanway and Millar, the printer, must have known, men would read almost any travel book they could find and were especially eager for those which revealed the possibilities of developing foreign trade. Though the *Account of the British Trade* has the same defects of style for which the author was later to be severely criticized, the edition sold rapidly and earned for Hanway a wide reputation as an able judge of business methods. This success strengthened his conviction that a man thoroughly trained in the ways of business was fitted to excel in whatever he attempted.

In January 1753, after Hanway had seen these volumes

through the press, he was again exhausted by his labours and in need of relaxation. He therefore decided to make a short trip abroad, going first to Paris, then to Brussels, Antwerp and Amsterdam. While he was away a Bill was introduced in Parliament to naturalize the Jews. There had been many such Bills before and there were to be many later. Over this one, however, Hanway became thoroughly aroused because he thought the whole proposal contrary to the interests, system of government and religion of the English people. From abroad he sent to the press the manuscript of a pamphlet embodying his views and, when he returned to England, followed this blast by four others, using much the same material. Although his influence was not sufficient to prevent the Bill from passing (26 George II, c. 26) Hanway's efforts, in the opinion of his biographer Pugh, first gave him the reputation of being a public-spirited man, and his pamphlets induced Parliament to repeal the Act in the next session, before any Hebrew had taken advantage of it.⁷

In 1754 Hanway was again in London with no regular employment and in some danger of the ennui he dreaded. When John Spranger wrote a pamphlet proposing changes in the paving and care of the streets, Hanway wrote to praise the plan and to make further suggestions, most of which were eventually adopted.

In 1756 he went by coach from Portsmouth to Kingston with some ladies of his acquaintance, and at their suggestion he published his journals of these travels at home as an example of how best to improve one's mind on such an expedition. Finding that public reception of *A Journal of Eight Days Journey from Portsmouth to Kingston* seemed likely to be unfavourable he withdrew it from circulation, rewrote it, and added an "Essay on Tea."⁸ When the revised edition drew Samuel Johnson's sarcasm, Hanway so

⁷ *Life*, 124.

⁸ Hanway, *A Journal of Eight Days Journey from Portsmouth to Kingston upon Thames, with Miscellaneous Thoughts, Moral and Religious; To Which is Added, An Essay on Tea, Considered as Per-
nicious to Health, Obstructing Industry, and Impoverishing the Nation* (1756); hereafter referred to as *Eight Days Journey*.

far lost his temper that he published a letter in the *Gazetteer* in which he seems to have threatened corporal punishment.⁹ In 1756 he also wrote a pamphlet of advice on the *Duty of a Good Citizen . . . War and Invasion*,¹⁰ urging that the public prepare for the French onslaught which, according to rumour, was imminent. These, however, were all casual enterprises of no particular importance; Hanway had not yet found employment worthy of his abilities.

Meanwhile his health had so improved that he feared that he had retired before he had amassed enough money to maintain himself and his widowed sister through the number of years they were likely to live. In 1755, 1756, 1760 and 1762 he sought a place where he could utilize his training in trade and add to his income. Archbishop Secker wrote a letter to the Duke of Newcastle in his favour, and Lady Betty Germaine, to whom Hanway had dedicated one of the volumes of his *Account of the British Trade*, sought the aid of the Duchess. Hanway himself wrote Newcastle that he felt he had some claim to consideration by the Navy Office because his father had been an officer and his brother Thomas, then Captain of the *Windsor*, had captured several vessels from the French. In 1762, after Hoare, Thornton and other leading merchants had intervened in his favour, Hanway finally received an appointment as Commissioner of the Victualling Board for the Navy at a salary of £400 a year, less a tax and plus allowances.¹¹ Here, according to Pugh, he was uncommonly assiduous and attentive; he would accept no present of any kind from contractors or other persons with whom he dealt. The position was not merely an honorary one for, although it now seems that it could have taken little of Hanway's time, his successor testified that he, himself, had no leisure after performing his duties.

Wherever he might be, Hanway learned from observation.

⁹ *Vide* Johnson's "Reply to a Paper . . .," *Works*, ed. A. Murphy (1806), II, 405. I have been unable to find this issue of the *Gazetteer*.

¹⁰ Hanway, *Thoughts on the Duty of a Good Citizen, with Regard to War and Invasion* (1756).

¹¹ "Reports of Commissions for Fees," *House of Commons Sessional Papers*, 1786-8, 553ff.

He had expressed admiration for Lieberkyn, physician to the King of Prussia, because this busy doctor found time to work among the poor and to advance schemes through which the indigent could improve their lot. In England also Hanway discovered that earnest men were constantly advocating various charities, both in private conversation and in published pamphlets. Robert Dingley suggested to Hanway in 1750 that they form a society to aid repentant prostitutes. Hanway approved of Dingley's efforts, but he felt that he could not work with such a group until he himself was beyond the age of worldly temptation, because the wits would be likely to destroy his usefulness by their ridicule. Charles Dingley proposed that they form an organization to send ragged street waifs to sea, where they might become useful, self-respecting members of the nation. The Marine Society grew out of this plan. Within a few squares of Hanway's home the Foundling Hospital was becoming a national institution which almost every Englishman was disposed either to praise immoderately or to censure violently. Hanway became a Governor of the hospital in May 1756 and continued to work both with it and among the parish poor after the funds of the hospital had been curtailed. He helped to raise money for the Army and Navy, and wrote books of religious advice to be given to soldiers and sailors. He was one of the founders of an academy to train officers for the Navy, and he published pamphlets on the best means to increase the number of sailors available for trade and for war. He was treasurer of a hospital designed to cure venereal diseases among the poor. He planned a reorganization of the English penal system which would stress reformation rather than punishment. He tried to force masters to give more humane treatment to their chimney sweep apprentices. When the Magdalen House for repentant prostitutes was finally organized he became a Governor. He suggested a method of reducing the public debt, and he showed how the quality of bread could be improved. For the lower classes he wrote books of advice and prayers for servants and apprentices and others, which he meant to form a moral and ethical code. For the upper

classes he wrote on the danger of late hours and the dissipation of Society, and on the value of Sunday Schools, the last of which he helped to organize for greater effectiveness. He deplored the irresponsibility of the Methodists, and wrote books on the necessity of taking the Sacrament regularly. Whatever the problem of the day might be Hanway applied to its solution his own practical common sense, certain that eventually men would realize that order and virtue were more conducive to happiness than the confusion and evil which he fought.

From the tone of his Introductions to the *Account of the British Trade* (1753) Hanway seems to have considered that this publication completed his life work. He was then past forty years of age, a longer span than most men might expect, and the rigours he had endured had left their mark upon his once handsome face and figure. His fortune, though small, he deemed sufficient to maintain him in quiet comfort for the few years he seemed likely to live. As a mark of his position he could even keep a carriage—though Hanway usually walked while his driver followed in the vehicle.

His figure, erect and spare, was of rather less than the average stature, and he dressed in conformity with the prevailing fashion, modified by his own good taste and a regard for his health. To be ready for all occasions he usually wore dress clothes with a large French bag wig.¹² His hat, ornamented by a gold button, was fashioned either to be worn on his head or carried under his arm. Like other men of his age who were susceptible to cold, he wore three pairs of stockings. For a formal occasion he dressed in a suit of rich, dark brown, the habit of merchants, with the coat and waistcoat ermine lined. At such times he also added a small, gold-hilted sword.

Many of Hanway's contemporaries regarded him as eccentric because he carried an umbrella. Although umbrellas were still objects of curiosity, they had been known in England in Elizabethan times. When Gay wrote *Trivia* some women seem to have used them as protection from the rain, and

¹² Pugh, *Life*, 220.

Robinson Crusoe devised one to shelter his head from the sun. Hanway, however, is reported to have been the first man to carry one in London.¹³ When he appeared on the streets, hackmen and chairmen threw mud and made ribald comment upon his appearance. By these attacks Hanway was unmoved; he found his umbrella convenient and continued to use it.

Hanway's friends observed that his features were small but not insignificant. His blue eyes "expressed the utmost humanity and benevolence,"¹⁴ and his calm voice was sincere and persuasive. He was most impressive when he was attempting to soothe distress or when urging virtue upon the wayward. When the benefits of trade and the nobility of the merchant character were under discussion Hanway became animated, for either subject roused him to extended eulogiums. These came to be borne in smiling patience by his friends.¹⁵ Fanny Burney recognized his spirit and ability even though she wished that he would not repeat information from the newspapers which everyone had read.¹⁶ Hanway's mind was continually active; he dreaded idleness and "that modern disorder which the French, who feel it not so much as ourselves, distinguish by the name of *ennui*."¹⁷

The pictures on his walls, chiefly illustrations of biblical stories, were meant to excite his guests to comment. Since Hanway had observed that awkward pauses in conversation resulted from visitors having nothing to say, he provided objects to interest them until such time as cards must be introduced.¹⁸ Through these pictures he hoped that his guests might become so absorbed in serious discussion that they would not wish for the games with which they ordinarily dissipated their time.

A striking example of this method of fixing the attention on "improving" thought was the lesson of humility, illus-

¹³ Pugh, *Life*, 221.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 219.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 228.

¹⁶ *The Diary and Correspondence of Madame D'Arblay*, ed. Charlotte Barrett, new edition (n.d.), I, 501.

¹⁷ Pugh, *Life*, 222.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 194-5.

trated for the benefit of the ladies. In the drawing-room of his house in Red Lion Square Hanway hung the portraits of six celebrated beauties about a mirror sufficiently convex to reflect a visitor's face proportionally. As his startled guest saw her reflection in this company she read the following verses :

Wert thou, my daughter, fairest of the seven,
Think on the progress of devouring Time,
And pay thy tribute to Humility.¹⁹

One wonders in what way Fanny Burney or Mrs. Montagu took this instruction.

The horrors of death and his own preparation for Judgment were constantly in Hanway's mind. He continually examined his own conscience and urged others to do likewise while there was yet time for reformation. Every thought, word and deed must be scanned in the light of possible disapproval in Heaven; everyone ought to study faithfully the Scriptures and the commentaries and religious advice of those who were conceded to have been in the way of salvation. Since the fallen angels had lost the seat of bliss through rebellion, men must, before God could trust them, discipline their spirits to accept the dictates of constituted authority. Therefore, as Hanway constantly stated in one form or another, "No Christian could be a rebel," and it was the imperative duty of all religious men to repeat the injunctions of the Bible to those guilty of the slightest disorder. Each morning, as soon as he awakened, he devoted some time to prayer and religious meditation, and every evening he held prayers with his family and servants. Compulsory attendance at prayers was then sufficiently unusual to cause a surprised coachman whom Hanway was engaging to hope that it would be "remembered" in his wages.²⁰ Another of the requisites for salvation was a regard for the well-being of the poor; one should exercise charity and guide the poor toward virtue.

To discipline his spirit Hanway surrounded himself with

¹⁹ Pugh, *Life*, 236.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 234.

objects to remind him of the awfulness of that decision which awaited everyone at death, a verdict from which there was no appeal. One such check to his conscience he placed where he must see it every time he dressed. In 1763, soon after moving to Red Lion Square, he had his declaration of faith inscribed on a large plate of enamelled brass, which would slide on rollers and form the back of his wardrobe. At the top were painted two figures of himself: on the left as an infant, on the right as he would appear on his deathbed. Beneath these portraits were the lines:

I BELIEVE THAT MY REDEEMER LIVETH,
AND THAT I ALSO SHALL RISE FROM
THE GRAVE.

JONAS HANWAY, ESQ.

WHO, TRUSTING IN THAT GOOD PROVIDENCE,
WHICH SO VISIBLY GOVERNS THE WORLD,
PASSED THROUGH A VARIETY OF FORTUNES WITH PATIENCE,
LIVING THE GREATEST PART OF HIS DAYS
IN FOREIGN LANDS, RULED BY ARBITRARY POWER,
HE RECEIVED THE DEEPER IMPRESSION
OF THE HAPPY CONSTITUTION OF HIS OWN COUNTRY;
WHILST
THE PERSUASIVE LAWS CONTAINED IN THE
NEW TESTAMENT,
AND THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF HIS OWN DEPRAVITY,
SOFTENED HIS HEART TO A SENSE
OF THE VARIOUS WANTS OF HIS
FELLOW CREATURES.

READER,

INQUIRE NO FURTHER;

THE LORD HAVE MERCY ON HIS SOUL AND THINE!
APPREHENSIVE OF THE TOO PARTIAL REGARD OF HIS
FRIENDS; AND ESTEEMING PLAIN TRUTH ABOVE THE
PROUDEST TROPHIES OF MONUMENTAL FLATTERY; AT
THE AGE OF FIFTY-ONE HE CAUSED THIS PLATE AND
INSCRIPTION TO BE MADE.²¹

²¹ Pugh, *Life*, 239.

All in all Hanway wrote over seventy books and pamphlets, a few of which seem now to be lost. In one way or another he might have described his work as a force to oppose the quantities of reading matter which "preyed on the purity of the heart, perverted the will, or darkened the understanding."²² Romantic novels, poems, and essays too often led untutored minds into error; at the least, they dissipated time which could be spent to much better advantage. Hanway's function was to call men to their duty and to show them the work which needed to be done. While he believed that if "half the apparent folly and wickedness we now find in the world could possibly be concealed, the other half would soon be diminished very considerably," he went on to say that men were "not therefore to remain quiet where evils are notorious."²³ When he saw the misery and wretchedness which constituted the lives of the poor, he strove to hammer the unpleasant details into the consciousness of the reading public until some improvement was made. This he did, yet he thought that in "spite of all the madness of the heart or head which prevails among us, we exist; we maintain things in tolerable good order, and we hope for better days."²⁴

Hanway expressed himself most clearly on the function of charity in his *Thoughts on the Plan for a Magdalen-House for Repentant Prostitutes* (1758):

Some charities from their very nature ought in all reason to decrease, for if acts of benevolence do not create less want and less misery, if those who have been relieved once shall for this and no better reason conclude that they have a right to be relieved again, the measure of such moral obligations between the rich and poor will be confounded; the virtue of the donor will pervert its own end, and create that very misery which he intended to prevent. It is an observation but too well founded that when the generality

²² Hanway, *The Citizen's Monitor: Shewing the Necessity of a Salutory Police, Executed by Resolute and Judicious Magistrates* (1780), 21; hereafter referred to as *The Citizen's Monitor*.

²³ Hanway, *Virtue in Humble Life, Containing Reflections on the Reciprocal Duties of the Wealthy and Indigent, the Master and Servant* (1774), I, x; hereafter referred to as *Virtue in Humble Life*.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

of the common people have worn off a sense of duty and, though able to work, are not ashamed to eat the bread of idleness, great misery and abuse of charity will creep in; and if corruption and bad examples turn panders to excess and luxury, many wants will be created even among the poor which have no existence from necessity; and which, otherwise, would have no existence at all. But it is in vain to contemplate the evils which have made such inroads upon us, unless we resolve upon measures to prevent their progress. If the vicious poor were oftener chastised and compelled to work, according to the great order of Providence, and if the virtuous poor were more timely relieved with gentleness and humanity, if a constant attendance were given, and a greater exertion of skill shown in the economy of parish affairs, we should not find so much money expended, seemingly in vain. There would not be such enormous sums devoted to charitable purposes, and yet our streets abounding with objects who are a shame to government and a disgrace to human nature.²⁵

To gather material and write his books as well as to attend to business at the Supply Office, Hanway laboured indefatigably; "he rose in the summer at four or five, and in the winter at seven; and having always business before him, he was every day employed till the time of retiring to rest."²⁶ His volumes were commonly dictated to one or two clerks from a charitable society or the Supply Office who had been invited to live in his house in order that they might attend him. This writing gave them the arduous training necessary for men of business, because Hanway required them to write accurately and legibly almost as rapidly as he spoke. Pugh, his first biographer, had been one of these clerks, and stated that he had written from dictation one of the pamphlets on bread—ninety octavo pages including statistical tables—in one forenoon.²⁷ If Pugh's statement is true, his speed was more than remarkable; if coloured by memory, he was disobeying Hanway's principle that men speak the literal truth, free from

²⁵ p. 50. This work is hereafter referred to as *Thoughts on the Magdalen*.

²⁶ Pugh, *Life*, 223.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 225.

all exaggeration. That Pugh could even think he wrote so much may explain why figures in Hanway's books express a general truth but are sometimes not strictly accurate.

Because of the multiplicity of his interests, Hanway's writing was subject to constant interruption, which made it difficult for him to organize his material :

By leaving his work to transact his ordinary business and afterwards recurring to it with new ideas, all his literary labours are defective in the arrangement of the matter, and appear to have too much of the miscellaneous in their composition. The original idea is sometimes left for the pursuit of one newly started, and either taken up again, when the mind of the reader has almost lost it, or it is totally deserted.²⁸

Writing from one to six books a year, Hanway habitually included his latest figures and plans for many charities in each volume, so that the reader might know the extent of the work which needed his aid and might choose the field in which he could best spend his time, energy and money. While prolixity was a natural result of this method, deletion might have left the reader sceptical as to the value of the activities of the various groups. For the people to whom Hanway wrote, his volumes were probably more convincing than those more carefully organized and with greater literary polish.

Hanway's method of writing makes it quite impracticable to discuss individual books. Even in discussing his philanthropic activities one cannot maintain a chronological order, for references to one theme may occur in volumes written in 1755, in 1765 and again in 1785. About fifty of his books and pamphlets, for instance, bespeak aid for poor foundlings. Here, again, Hanway could point out to those who cavilled at the repetition that one should never neglect an opportunity to stress the plight of these unfortunate children, for they were never sufficiently relieved. The next two chapters will seek to reveal his efforts in their behalf.

²⁸ Pugh, *Life*, 225-6.

CHAPTER II

THE FOUNDLING HOSPITAL

I

IN May 1756 Jonas Hanway, having given £50 to the Foundling Hospital, was elected one of the Governors of the institution. For fifteen years this group of men had been directing work among the poor, and the organization was then at the height of its popularity and influence. In his capacity as Governor of the hospital Hanway became familiar with the problems presented by various ramifications of poverty; he learned why some philanthropic projects had failed and heard arguments advanced in favour of other plans. Indeed, the story of the Foundling Hospital illustrates, in miniature, the history of the "trial and error" philanthropy of the century. A survey of conditions then existent and an outline of the Foundling Hospital's history is necessary to comprehension of the difficulties experienced by Hanway and the Governors in their charitable endeavours as well as of the perplexities of the Londoners who judged their efforts.

In the first half of the eighteenth century children of the London poor had little chance to survive; statistics show that three-fourths of all babies born in London died before they reached the age of five.¹ Reading Cadogan's *Essay on Nursing* (1748) and other contemporary literature concerning the hardships these small mortals suffered, one wonders that any of them lived. Physicians apparently knew little about children's diseases, and there was no maternity hospital or infirmary to which infants might be taken. Approximately a thousand babies under twelve months of age came annually to the workhouse to be sheltered with the infirm, the criminal, and the feeble-minded; and to these were added five or six hundred boys and girls between one and ten years old who had

¹ Ernest Caulfield, *Infant Welfare Movement in the Eighteenth Century* (New York 1931), 179.

been left orphans or abandoned on the streets, or who were children of parents having families too large for them to support. Of all these, a few would later be taken from the workhouse by their parents or kinsmen; only a dozen or so would live to the age of ten, when they could be apprenticed.²

A hospital to care specifically for these children was first proposed in the reign of Anne, when intelligent citizens apparently realized the need for such an institution. Addison and Steele commented from time to time on nurses who deliberately killed their charges as well as upon individual cases of suffering which they observed. The philanthropist Robert Nelson pointed out in his *Address to Persons of Quality and Estate* (1715) the many reasons why these babies should be protected. Nevertheless at that time no one arose who had sufficient driving force to carry the project through to success, and the most that proponents of such plans could do was to will money for the use of such an institution if and when it should be established. Infants continued to be placed in charge of the parish overseer and he, angered by an additional burden on the budget, boarded the child with a nurse at a cost ranging from sixpence to two shillings and sixpence a week. The value of this nurse was generally understood by overseer, nurse, and the public to be proportionate to the rapidity with which babes entrusted to her care died. The practice of thus disposing of unwanted children was so general that, as late as 1748, the average person would probably have agreed that Deborah gave Squire Allworthy sound advice when she told him to put Tom Jones out in the wet, windy street and hope that the parish officer would discover him the next morning.

In the first half of the century any attempt to establish a Foundling Hospital had to meet the objection advanced against most charitable plans; namely, that it was wrong to alleviate the sufferings of the poor. That all foundlings were illegitimate was assumed, and that the hospital would provide an easy way of getting rid of bastards, thus encouraging vice,

² *Journals of the House of Commons*, XXXI, 248-9 (March 24th, 1767).

was a prevalent conviction.³ When waifs whose parents had wed were pointed out, objectors said that these parents must accept responsibility for their offspring if either the parent or the child was to become a respectable member of the community. If the child was starving, the Government should provide minimum subsistence. That was all.

Most of the credit for establishing the Foundling Hospital must go to Thomas Coram, a retired sea captain living in London. He spent seventeen years soliciting financial support and securing a charter, "induced thereto by his well-known zeal for the public, and the shocking spectacles he had seen of innocent children who had been murdered and thrown upon dunghills."⁴ During these seventeen years he met with indifference, frank opposition, coarse satire, and even insinuations against his own morals. In a letter to a friend in America dated September 13th, 1740 he wrote, "Many weak persons, more Ladies than Gentlemen, say such a foundation will be the promotion of wickedness."⁵ One man requested that his wife deliver some money to the hospital, "but she would by no means encourage so wicked a thing."⁶ In attempting to present a petition to the Princess Amelia at the Court of St. James, Coram was turned away with rough words by Lady Isabella Finch, lady-in-waiting. Yet if his petitions were to be successful, they must be signed by prominent members of society:

For without that roundabout way, I found it was impossible to be done, for I could no more prevail upon any archbishop or bishop or nobleman Briton, or foreigner or any other great man—I tried them all—to speak to the late King or his present Majesty on this affair than I could have prevailed with any of them, if I had tried it—such was the unchristian shyness of all about the Court.⁷

³ B. K. Gray, *History of English Philanthropy* (1905), 94-5.

⁴ Hanway, *A Candid Historical Account of the Hospital for the Reception of Exposed and Deserted Young Children* (1759), v; hereafter referred to as *Candid Account*.

⁵ R. H. Nichols and F. H. Wray, *History of the Foundling Hospital* (1935), 21.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.*, 19-20.

Finally Coram succeeded in collecting two lists of signatures, one of ladies and one of gentlemen, and these he sent with his petition to King George.

On October 17th, 1739 George II granted the charter, naming the Duke of Bedford as President of the Board of Governors,⁸ all of whom were men zealous for the public welfare. A month after the charter was granted they met to choose a committee of fifty noblemen and gentlemen to manage the estate and effects of the hospital. At this first meeting Coram spoke movingly of the nobility of their work and warned them that they must exercise unusual care if the project was to be successful, because the public doubted the moral benefit of easing the burden of those they assumed to be immoral. Later in the month the General Committee ordered letters to be written to the various English ambassadors abroad for accounts of similar institutions in foreign countries,⁹ in answer to which reports from Paris, Amsterdam, Venice and Lisbon were received.

From the beginning the Governors seem to have planned for permanence, expansion and perhaps a general admission of children from all parts of England as soon as funds and equipment could be provided.¹⁰ Their immediate objects, as stated by Coram, were first to "prevent the frequent murders of poor miserable infants at their birth," and second to "suppress the inhuman custom of exposing new-born infants to perish in the streets."¹¹ Because funds were limited, the affairs of the Hospital required careful supervision. The *Report of the Committee* for 1740 gave the annual revenue as £600, which the members thought would permit the hospital to admit sixty children each year.

Because the General Committee believed that the country was more healthy and less expensive than London, they now ordered letters to be written to various parts of England in

⁸ *The Royal Charter* . . . (1740).

⁹ Hanway, *Account of the Hospital for the Maintenance and Education of Exposed and Deserted Young Children* (1759), vii-viii; hereafter referred to as *Account of the Hospital*.

¹⁰ Nichols and Wray, *History*, 28.

¹¹ John Brownlow, *History and Design of the Foundling Hospital* (1858), 4-5.

order to determine where nurses might be procured and children cared for most cheaply. At the same time, to provide for some infants until a permanent home could be obtained, they rented, furnished and staffed a house in Hatton Gardens. Refusing to buy Montague House, Strafford House, a house at Ranelagh, or one at Chelsea, the Governors decided to build a central hospital and purchased the Earl of Salisbury's estate in Lamb's Conduit Fields.¹² Here the Foundling Hospital remained until it was moved during the last decade to Berkhamsted.

The first twenty children were taken in on Lady Day, 1741. An advertisement printed in the newspapers the previous day stated that all children accepted must be under two months of age and free of contagious diseases, such as the King's Evil and leprosy.¹³ While the Governors promised that no questions should be asked of anyone bringing a child, they requested that the infant have affixed to it some writing or token by which it could be identified should those who brought it ever desire its return. In thus recognizing a necessity for keeping secret the origin of the baby, the Governors ignored Coram's early warning not to arouse the prejudices of the public.

The Governors seem to have assumed that few women would wish to leave their offspring with the hospital, but the response to the first advertisement was so great that only half of the infants brought could be accommodated. As the children began to thrive under the hospital regime, more mothers appeared in answer to each succeeding notice. The nurses, like the children, were subject to examination for contagious diseases. Although a parish nurse might have as many as twenty babies in her charge within a year, the Foundling Hospital refused to allow one woman to care for more than two or three, and planned to discharge automatically any nurse who lost a third child placed in her care. As a result of this enlightened practice, only 66 died among the 136 admitted the first year. Learning by experience the Governors

¹² Nichols and Wray, *History*, 28.

¹³ Quoted in Brownlow, *History*, 6-7.

improved their procedure, and the fame of the hospital grew until as many as a hundred women might present themselves with their infants on a day when only twenty were to be admitted. Mothers, knowing that the only chance their babies had to survive was through the care of the Foundling Hospital, so kicked, fought and struggled to have their own accepted that the Governors were forced to devise a system of choosing by lot.¹⁴

Since the public certainly would not encourage or support any project to increase the number of beggars and paupers infesting the city, the Governors attempted to create a favourable attitude toward the hospital by educating the children to support themselves in later life. In 1748 the hospital advertised that the boys were intended for sea service and for husbandry, thus informing the people that these youths who otherwise might become dependent were to be schooled in trades.¹⁵ To prepare the children for apprenticeship the boys were put to work in the open air picking oakum; the girls were first set to winding silk and later trained in sewing and spinning. In 1753 the kitchen in the west wing was converted into a shop where the children might work in public for all passers-by to see the virtue and utility of the experiment. The hospital thus proved and made known its value.

Since the hospital grounds were then on the edge of London and not filled with the dirt and smoke of the city, people of fashion came to regard the spot as a favourite place for a stroll and, to encourage interest in the institution, its officers welcomed them. Furthermore, at a time when no public galleries existed, the Governors allowed artists to hang paintings on the Foundling's walls. Reynolds was always deeply interested in the place. Hogarth became a Governor, painted pictures which he presented to it, and designed a shield (now lost) for the entrance. Handel was also a Governor, and besides leaving it a "fair copy" of the *Messiah*, he gave benefit concerts which became so popular that many patrons had to be turned away. A club of "dilettanti" met in one

¹⁴ Brownlow, *History*, 7-8.

¹⁵ Nichols and Wray, *History*, 130-1.

of the hospital's rooms. The institution appeared in literature when Sir Launcelot Greaves was abducted while keeping an appointment in the hospital grounds, and Brooke was surely thinking of the Foundling's subsidiaries when Harry Clinton spoke of colonies of thirty boys or thirty girls singing at their work.¹⁶ The artist and the hospital profited one another; in passing, it may be noted that modern charities have added little to the Foundling's methods of getting publicity.

Perhaps the two greatest services of the Foundling during its first decades lay in making public the difficulties encountered by the poor in their efforts to exist and in furthering the study of pediatrics by providing a laboratory for physicians. Part of the interest which Locke had aroused in the education of children turned toward measures of health. New books on child care were written and old ones translated from the Latin, so that in the 'forties "English pediatric literature was enriched to an extent that was not equalled by any other decade before the nineteenth century."¹⁷ When Walter Shandy read all these books that he could find, he merely kept abreast of the scientific progress of his day; people generally believed that they could increase both the health and the intelligence of their offspring. When Mrs. Shandy wanted the local midwife to attend her and her husband insisted upon obtaining the services of Dr. Slop, a learned "operator" who had written a book upon the subject, the reading public could visualize their argument. The hypochondriac Matthew Bramble constantly remarked upon the strange prescriptions of professed healers; the novelists met a contemporary interest when they introduced a Dr. Fathom or a Ferret. The implication to be drawn from literature was that men deserved what they got if they did not insist upon proper medical care.

The decade from 1740 to 1750 marked a revival of common sense in infant welfare. Sir Hans Sloane, Governor and Consulting Physician of the Foundling, in a letter to the committee dated October 28th, 1748, observed that their

¹⁶ *The Fool of Quality*, 370.

¹⁷ Caulfield, *Infant Welfare Movement*, 92-3.

experiences showed that while one-half to two-thirds of the babies died in the care of dry nurses, only one in five died when they were breast-fed. During his fifty years of practice he too had noted that two-thirds of the infants fed without the breast generally died, notwithstanding what he or anyone else could do to help them.¹⁸ Sir Hans also believed that the results of the hospital's first year had added to the proof that the country was more healthful than the city since only twenty-nine out of eighty children sent to the country had died, but forty-five of the fifty-six kept in town had perished. The difference in mortality did not seem to Sir Hans to be due to different care but to the fact that the air of London was less pure.¹⁹ On the first page of his *Essay* Cadogan pointed out the usefulness of the Foundling as a laboratory and observed that it might be of more value than the world was inclined to believe. It might not only prevent murder, but it might also be the means of introducing a "more reasonable and more natural method of nursing." Cadogan believed that the care of children had been too long turned over to women, who could not be supposed to have fit knowledge for the task²⁰—a comment appropriated by Walter Shandy.

This William Cadogan became a fashionable West End practitioner and, later, chief Honorary Physician to the Foundling Hospital. His *Essay on Nursing*, which was published by the General Committee of the hospital, sold widely and ran through many editions in the 'fifties and 'sixties. In this book he stated sensibly many of the ideas and methods now associated with *Emile*.

Cadogan believed that most children's diseases were attributable to the babes being over-clothed and over-fed. Because women thought that a new-born infant could not be kept too warm, they overwhelmed it with a quantity of "flannels, wrappers, swathes, stays, etc." whose total weight equalled that of the child. Then, when the child had become

¹⁸ John Brownlow, *Memoranda; or Chronicles of the Foundling Hospital* (1847), 210ff.

¹⁹ Hanway, *Account of the Hospital*, xi.

²⁰ William Cadogan, *Essay on Nursing*, ninth edition (1769), 1.

too tender to bear the chilly air, "this hot-bed plant is sent out into the country to be reared in a leaky house that lets in wind and rain from every quarter."²¹ The infant really needed less clothes in proportion than would a grown person because, as the thermometer proved, it was naturally warmer. Like Sir Hans Sloane, Cadogan was annoyed that women swaddled babies tightly; their bowels were not left free, and unused limbs became deformed because they were so tender they yielded to pressure and strain.²² In addition, some "imagine that clean linen and fresh clothes draw, and rob them of their nourishing juices . . ."²³ Cadogan wanted their clothes changed daily.

Proper food was more important to a child than its dress. The parent should try to follow nature. For example, women should realize that since a mother had no milk for her baby until the third day after its birth, a new-born infant was not hungry. When a child was immediately sent to a nurse, it was "overpowered," the mother had no relief, and milk fever resulted; both suffered. As if this were not enough:

The general practice is as soon as a child is born to cram a dab of butter and sugar down its throat, a little oil, panada, caudle, or some such unwholesome mess. . . .

It is the custom of some to give a little roast pig to an infant, which, it seems, is to cure it of all the mother's longings.

Cadogan thought children might be healthier if "these matters were a little more inquired into . . ."²⁴

The doctors served public health as well as the hospital when they found more successful treatment for the common diseases of distemper, itch, scrofula and smallpox. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu had introduced inoculation for smallpox, and Dr. Conyers immunized children in this way as early as June 1743. Because people in the neighbourhood feared inoculation might cause a plague, he rented a house in another quarter of London, where the patients were quarantined. Children were treated at about the age of five; and the

²¹ *Essay on Nursing*, 9-10.

²² *Ibid.*, 11-14.

²³ *Ibid.*, 14.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

Governors required their servants and nurses to be immune from the disease. During the smallpox outbreak in 1749, the hospital advertised that families should be inoculated, assuring men that all the eighty inmates treated in the Foundling had survived the operation. When a child died in 1751, the Governors advertised this fact also, but they explained that the service had been performed at some distance from the hospital itself. In 1756 Dr. Conyers attempted to test his method by treating at the same time eight children, to four of whom the serum had been communicated by friction and to four others by incision. In 1751 the hospital considered sending some of its wards to Brighton for sea bathing, but Dr. Mead objected that the cost of the trip was excessive if, as he thought, drinking the transported sea water would prove equally health-giving.²⁵ Perhaps he shared some of the scepticism with which Mr. Bramble regarded the facilities at Bath:

We know not what sores may be running into the waters while we are bathing, and what sort of matter we may thus imbibe; the king's evil, the scurvy, the cancer, and the pox; and, no doubt, the heat will render the *virus* the more volatile and penetrating.²⁶

Working in their laboratory under a necessity to improve on old procedures, doctors laid increasing stress on scientific investigation. They agreed with Mr. Shandy that the modern age was ready to supersede the wisdom of Lord Verulam.

Year by year more men became aware of the surprising success of the hospital. Books like *Tom Jones* and Johnson's *Life of Savage* made them eager to give the unfortunate a chance to become sturdy citizens rather than parasites. From 1741 to May 1756 the hospital admitted 1384 children, an average of less than one hundred each year. Of these only 724 (52 per cent) had died, which, according to Hanway, meant that a child's chance of survival was about ten times better there than in the workhouse and, according to

²⁵ Nichols and Wray, *History*, *passim*.

²⁶ *Humphry Clinker*, Letter to Dr. Lewis, April 28th.

Edmonds, at least as good as that of the average infant in all London.²⁷

At about the time the work of the Foundling was meeting recognition, a feeling had grown up that the country was losing population through the constant wars and generally unsettled habits of living. Alarm was apparent before 1740 over losses in the war with France. Because no census had been taken since that of William the Conqueror, no one knew that the population was actually increasing. At the same time there was a settled conviction that English and French armies must continue to wage wars until one country or the other was irretrievably ruined. The country wanted more men, and the Governors of the hospital were eager to expand the sphere of their usefulness. Under all these influences Parliament made an initial grant of £10,000 to the Foundling, providing that any baby brought to it from any part of England should be received; in June 1756 the hospital hung a basket at the door with a bell to call an attendant.

In May Hanway had become a Governor because he saw in this enterprise an outlet for his interest in useful charity. The poor would have been fortunate had he become a member earlier, for Hanway, methodical and efficient, felt that he must familiarize himself with all phases of their problems before he could argue sensibly on the merits of a solution. He contented himself in 1756 with observing to the public that in London seven out of ten infants were said to die before reaching the age of two, while in the country seven out of ten lived.²⁸ If the children of the poor were sent into the country to be nursed, he wondered if one-half of them might not live to the age of thirty-four and add greatly to the strength of the nation both in its armed forces and in its labourers. He called for a law "to subject every man or woman to be whipped at the cart's tail who appears as a beggar with children . . . such children . . . to be delivered as foundlings . . . to the care of an hospital to be provided for that purpose."²⁹ He said frankly that he did not know

²⁷ Quoted by Caulfield, *Infant Welfare Movement*, 179.

²⁸ "An Essay on Tea," *Eight Days Journey*, 239-42.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 239.

whether the excessive death rate of London rose chiefly from "vicious indulgences" or from "ignorance and stupidity," but he was sure that a dead child was

"... a more pleasing and a more familiar object to the generality of common nurses than a living one; and that by habit they contract as little sensibility of the death of others as a common soldier after a dozen bloody campaigns."³⁰

Hanway did not feel qualified to write with authority on the problems of the hospital until 1759, when he brought out *A Candid Historical Account of the Hospital for the Reception of Exposed and Deserted Young Children*. Meanwhile the Governors had lost the sympathy of the nation, and they were to lose the financial support of Parliament a few months later.

After it was too late, many could see that the hospital had expanded too rapidly. In place of the 100 children customarily admitted each year, the Governors received 117 the first day of the general admission in 1756, and 425 the first month. These were all under two months of age. In 1757 Parliament appropriated £30,000 and extended the age to six months. Wishing to have the infants breast-fed as long as possible and fearing that those over six months of age were purposely allowed to die, Parliament later extended the age limit to one year.³¹ During the three years and ten months in which the hospital received all English babies as they were brought, 14,935 children entered the Foundling, an average of over 4,000 each year. The total cost to the nation was about £500,000; approximately thirty per cent, or 4,400 infants lived to be apprenticed.³²

Through his criticism and praise Hanway reveals both the faults and the merits of the hospital in the years from 1756

³⁰ "An Essay on Tea," *Eight Days Journey*, 239.

³¹ Hanway, *Candid Account*, 25.

³² In *Memoranda* (footnote, 175), Brownlow quotes Baker's *Life of Sir Thomas Bernard, Bart.* on the mortality in the later Dublin Foundling Hospital: "Of 12,641 children received in six years, ending the 24th of June, 1796, so many as 9,804 had died; 2,692 were unaccounted for, and only 145 were to be traced. . . . Of 5,216 children sent into the infirmary in those six years, three . . . came out . . . alive."

to 1760; his books exhibit the candour and common sense which established his reputation as a dependable philanthropist. He believed that the Governors had failed because they had not always consulted the desires of the public or faced the facts.

The hospital, Hanway decided, could not hope to fulfil one of the purposes for which it had been founded: it could not prevent women from murdering their illegitimate children, because these crimes were committed at the moment of delivery in order to conceal the mother's shame. No one could estimate the number of these. Once a child was born and the world aware of its existence, however, it could be abandoned on the street more safely and conveniently than it could be killed.³³ These deserted waifs, who might otherwise perish from exposure, the hospital might save. An even more valuable contribution of the Foundling was the education of women in the care of infants, because Hanway was positive that for one babe strangled, five thousand died through the ignorance or neglect of the mother and five thousand more by being taken from the mother's breast.³⁴

Hanway agreed with the general public that the secrecy which veiled the parentage of children admitted to the institution was neither necessary nor conducive to good order. No attempt had ever been made to discover whether or not the general assumption that the children were bastards was correct. Nor had the use of the hospital been limited to infants whose parents were too poor to support them. For the benefit of all concerned, the exact status of the child must be determined, because men must live openly in order to live "happily and innocently."³⁵ The public naturally assumed that rich men, able to support their children, availed themselves of an opportunity to dispose of those begotten out of wedlock. The anonymity provided by the basket at the door was of no advantage to the poor, because they had no funds

³³ Hanway, *An Earnest Appeal for Mercy to the Children of the Poor*, particularly those belonging to the Parishes within the Bills of Mortality (1766), 24-5; hereafter referred to as *Appeal for Mercy*.

³⁴ *Candid Account*, 44.

³⁵ *Appeal for Mercy*, 67.

to keep secret their shame. Furthermore, a general admission tempted people to dispose of all unwanted children and so to evade their own responsibilities.

Continuing this line of argument, Hanway reasoned that the ease with which anyone could dispose of his progeny acted to discourage matrimony. After the Act of 13 George II had provided that

. . . no churchwarden, overseer, or other person whatsoever, shall, by virtue or authority of any law in being, for the provision or maintenance of the poor, or for bastard children, stop, molest, or disturb any person, in bringing any child or children to the foundling hospital,

both putative fathers and parish officers attempting to diminish the Poor's Rate forced infants from their mothers, and children better reared in the country were brought to a city which would not benefit from them.³⁶ This interfered with the country custom of not marrying until the woman proved to be with child for, as a ballad writer pointed out,³⁷ when any infant could be admitted to the hospital, the father was under no compulsion to marry unless he really wished. Since anyone could see that a sober married man worked better and from two to four hours longer in order to provide for his family, marriage must be protected by the State, and fathers forced to care for their own offspring.³⁸ Mr. Smith told Evelina bluntly that he did not wish to acquire the restraint of a wife. Hanway reminded the English that there was a sound basis for the religious principle that anything which tended to encourage promiscuity should be shunned and that celibacy was never desirable except when it was necessary to preserve life.³⁹

Hanway found, furthermore, that the practice of bringing country babies to London was neither economical nor expedient. Living was cheaper outside the capital; and many labourers and husbandmen managed to support a wife and

³⁶ *Candid Account*, 35-6.

³⁷ "Good News to Bachelors and Maids," Burney Collection, British Museum.

³⁸ *Candid Account*, 46.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

six children in the country on six to eight shillings a week, perhaps fifty shillings per annum for each of their progeny. Away from London there was also a better opportunity for the child to be self-supporting as he reached manhood; in cities such as Norwich and Birmingham, children of seven were reputed to earn more than their own livelihood.⁴⁰ Hanway reported that, whereas the total cost of rearing a foundling to the apprenticing age of ten amounted to sixty pounds in the city, in the country twenty-five would suffice. The death rate under two years of age in country villages was frequently as low as six per cent—in Birmingham it was only twenty-five—but in the hospital it was over fifty. Admitting children from the country was also inexpedient in that the child was cut off from family restraint and home training; it felt no necessity to maintain the decent position acquired by its forbears.⁴¹ Thus an institution handicapped its wards, and neither the husbandman nor the manufacturer repaid the nation's consideration, because neither produced more goods for sale or consumed more on which he could pay taxes.⁴² There was no advantage at all in opening the Foundling to children from outside of London.

The many men who doubted the advisability of appropriating money for such an institution as the Foundling were certain to watch its procedure carefully. They pointed to mistakes and circulated many scandalous stories about the zeal with which the poor now freed themselves of their obligations. Some indigent persons not only showed a lamentable eagerness to evade the responsibility of caring for their offspring, but they also exhibited deplorable indifference as to the state in which their newborn babies completed the long, rough journey to London. To relieve parents by taking children to the hospital became a new occupation. One carrier was found drunk on a village green, with some of his charges in a basket beside him dead from the night's exposure. Another, travelling by horseback, had filled his panniers with infants

⁴⁰ *Candid Account*, 47.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 34.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 47.

for the hospital. At Monmouth a poor man was put on trial for murder when his newborn child was found in a creek with a stone tied to its head; he gained acquittal, however, by proving that he had given a guinea to a strolling tinker to carry it to London. Of a cartload of babies which bounced and jolted its way over the rough roads to the hospital, the only survivor was one whose mother followed on foot in order to nurse her babe as the vehicle halted.⁴³ Donors to the basket at the door were still requested to affix some token by which the child could be identified later if the parent wished, but whether or not this was provided, the carriers frequently stripped it of its clothes to make an extra penny. When infants continued to arrive naked, often with violent colds, criticisms were levelled at the hospital. The Governors therefore published a notice asking for witnesses to testify against those guilty of ill-treatment, promising to prosecute those who contributed to murder. On all this Hanway wrote angrily that there must be a change or some men would go to Tyburn, that country children should never have been brought, and that London infants should be delivered only by the overseer of the parish poor after he had investigated each case.⁴⁴

Hanway criticized one procedure of the hospital which inadvertently prevented some parents from recovering their children. Since the support of each foundling cost the general public £7 10s. per annum, the Governors strove to protect themselves and the taxpayers by requiring that maintenance be paid for at this rate before releasing a boy or girl to the parents. Furthermore, the Governors believed that if a father could pay for his child's support, he certainly should do so; therefore they demanded that anyone inquiring for his offspring deposit a sum equal to that spent for it before being told whether or not his child was still alive. Hanway pointed out that anyone who had ever had to entrust his infant to a foundling hospital was never likely to have sufficient money to meet such a rule and that only seventy-five children were

⁴³ Hanway, *Letters on the Importance of the Rising Generation of the Labouring Part of our Fellow-Subjects* (1767), I, 161-2; hereafter referred to as *Letters on the Rising Generation*.

⁴⁴ *Candid Account*, 67-8.

reclaimed between 1741 and 1759. The difficulties of identifying a foundling were great; a banker who made inquiries regarding his parentage discovered that he had been delivered stark naked to the hospital door.⁴⁵ Hanway thought that the hospital should urge parents to recover and rear their own children and that the rule requiring payment for maintenance defeated its own purpose.

These suggestions and criticisms Hanway made only after he had thoroughly investigated the work of the hospital and compared it, so far as he then could, with the workhouse regime, which it superseded. His strictures were made only in order that the administration might become more effective; he wrote for the public because he felt that if men were thoroughly informed on the problems faced by a charitable institution, they would support it more intelligently. While he gave specific information which might seem to justify disapproval, he always recommended a change in method which he believed would eliminate waste or abuse.

Hanway was equally vigorous in defending the hospital on its merits and in making known that which he found good. The fact that one half of its charges died before they were two years of age seemed conclusive evidence to the general public that the Governors were no more efficient in saving life than the workhouse had been. Hanway pointed out that ten times as many had lived as could have been expected to survive in the workhouse, for under that system only four to eight per cent lived to be apprenticed, and these were scrawny and dwarfed. Overseers, acting from habit, business and convenience, had considered saving lives so hopeless that "they at length sat down contented, the very attempt to preserve them [the babies] seeming to be a farce."⁴⁶ When the hospital opened its doors to infants from the whole country London overseers hurried all their charges there and thus saved the trouble and expense of nursing. When the master of a workhouse (probably St. Martin's-in-the-Fields) had been

⁴⁵ Dickens, who liked to attend the hospital chapel, based part of the plot of "No Thoroughfare" on an actual occurrence there.

⁴⁶ *Candid Account*, 84-5.

challenged for forcing a child, which might eventually become a parish ward, from its mother's breast, he had answered quite candidly that "we send all our children to the Foundling Hospital; we have not saved one alive for fourteen years."⁴⁷ Because parents as well as overseers sought to evade the trouble and expense of burying their offspring, the Governors observed grimly that many infants lived only to be registered. As for country children, how could one be healthy on admittance if it had been jolted across England and stripped before delivery by the carriers? Bad as it was, the death-rate was not entirely the fault of the hospital; and compared to that of the work-house, the record was good.

Hanway felt that the English public should be reasonable in criticizing the high rate of mortality. No hospital accustomed to admitting one hundred children each year could immediately adjust its procedure to the requirements of four thousand. The nurses could not be as carefully supervised, and more babies had to be entrusted to each. Proper care was impossible. Furthermore, infants from the workhouses arrived filthy and diseased, too weak to have been moved safely:

Some of these children are not in a condition to be sent into the country: of 251 sent, in 18 months, into one of the hospital infirmaries, only 39 came out alive, and of them 20 died very soon after . . .⁴⁸

In the four years after Parliament had made the admission of children general, the hospital had been forced to admit about two thousand babes like these.

Problems of nursing multiplied because about two-thirds of the babies were less than three weeks old and had been brought "reeking from the mother's womb." From the following figures on the children delivered between December 1758 and June 1759 Hanway believed⁴⁹ that numbers of foundlings had been deserted on the streets of London not

⁴⁷ *Appeal for Mercy*, 8.

⁴⁸ *Candid Account*, 77.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 26-7.

only because the parents were poor but also because they simply would not care for their offspring:

<i>Age.</i>	<i>Number.</i>
1 to 4 days old	523
5 to 14 days old	394
16 to 18 days old	613
	— 1,530
5 to 8 weeks old (inclusive)	411
9 to 16 weeks old (inclusive)	172
5 to 11 months old (inclusive)	158
	— 741
	—
Total	2,271

Of the 6,601 children who died before June 1759:

5,318 died under the age of six months	80½ per cent
783 died under the age of twelve months	12 per cent
500 died under the age of two years	7½ per cent ⁵⁰

More than two-thirds of the babies brought to the hospital were less than twenty days old. Of course most of them died. Why blame the hospital?

Hanway estimated that the Foundling could be the means of saving eight hundred lives each year. To demonstrate that it was already doing so, he called attention to the fact that in London there were more christenings and 653 fewer burials in 1758 than there had been in 1757. Since the country was at war and the distress of the poor was increasing, Hanway believed that this improvement was entirely due to the hospital.⁵¹ He also estimated that fifty-two per cent of the children brought to the institution before November 1759 were alive at that date and that fifty-one per cent might live to be apprenticed.⁵² Although public opposition to the Foundling had been steadily growing, the Governors had given their children a chance to live.

A theoretical criticism of the hospital was that such an enterprise was not properly a function of government at all.

⁵⁰ *Candid Account*, 76-7.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 74.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 77.

As the eighteenth century interpreted Locke's argument on the rights of property, no one could deprive an individual of his money without his consent, and governments were formed to maintain order and to protect property.⁵³ It was right for the individual to give money for charity if he wished—that was his own affair—but no one should have his property confiscated in order to maintain others. The Poor Laws did this, it was true, but they had originated from the desire, and were still designed, to maintain order.⁵⁴ The hospital, although supported by taxation, was lavish in its regard for the welfare of the child. Critics alleged that it unfitted its wards for the life of arduous labour which must perforce be theirs. In fact, the £7 10s. appropriated annually for each child in the Foundling was larger than the amount on which—as Hanway himself showed later—a poor man might support each member of his family. There was no tradition of taxation to better the lives of the poor, and the public were not convinced that it was desirable to create one.

Hanway repeatedly stated that he was interested in “political humanity,” that is, he believed that charity should benefit every member of the nation and never should benefit the indigent at the expense of the wealthy. He believed, and he tried continually to demonstrate, that the work of the hospital was both profitable and economically necessary to everyone in the kingdom. Because he was as methodical and orderly as Walter Shandy, another merchant retired from the Turkey Company, he reduced his hypothesis to pounds, shillings and pence. Although Hanway varied the figures in support of this thesis from book to book, the same conclusion remained. In his *Letters on the Rising Generation*⁵⁵ (1767) he estimated the national income at £63,000,000 for a population of 7,000,000. Of these, 3,500,000 worked 313 days of the year at 1s. 1½d. per day, or £17 18s. 7d. per annum (Hanway's total). A boy of fifteen had cost the

⁵³ Paschal Larkin, *Property in the Eighteenth Century* (Dublin 1930), *passim*.

⁵⁴ A. G. L. Rogers's “Introduction” to his edition of Sir Frederic M. Eden's *The State of the Poor* (1928), xxiii–xxiv.

⁵⁵ Vol. II, 95–6.

hospital £86 5s. to rear, and he then had an expectancy of twenty-three years for labour. During his life he would earn £412 7s. 5d., which represented a profit to the public of £326 2s. 5d.⁵⁶ In his *Candid Account* Hanway had estimated that of the 2,600 infants supposed to have been received from within the bills of mortality, 752 would live to the age of ten, when they would be apprenticed and earn their own living. While five per cent of these would probably die between the ages of ten and twenty, the labour of the other 715, working at £4 per year, would amount to £28,600. After the age of twenty they should work an average of fifteen years at £15 per annum each, a total of £160,875 and a grand total of £189,475. Subtracting £63,226, the total cost of their maintenance in the Foundling, Hanway showed that their lives represented a national gain of £126,248 10s. On twenty such groups of "these poor miserable and once death-devoted foundlings" the public would actually gain £2,524,970.⁵⁷ "Political prudence" demanded that the nation preserve its poor, for these figures showed "whence those immense sums flow which are necessary to support us in war, since without industry we could not even run in debt to each other, for there could not be a circulation of property."⁵⁸

The effectiveness of this argument was somewhat diminished because ratepayers as individuals could always count their taxes in money more easily than they could count their individual profits from state institutions. A lower Poor Rate would be a tangible and immediate benefit.

In 1759 Hanway summed up his recommendations and criticisms on the policies of the Hospital in a list of suggested changes:

1. It should be called the "Orphans' Hospital" to avoid the stigma of bastardy, because many of its inmates were legitimate.
2. Overseers and masters of workhouses within the

⁵⁶ pp. 80-5.

⁵⁷ *Candid Account*, 80-5.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 83.

bills of mortality should be allowed to send children from or deserted in their parishes.

3. The hospital should receive : (a) the legitimate and very poor, born within the bills of mortality; (b) the illegitimate and very poor, born within the bills of mortality; (c) orphans, or those whose parents had run away; (d) infants found deserted.

4. Delivery to the hospital should always be through an overseer or master of a workhouse.

5. Those admitted should not be more than twelve months of age, unless recommended by three overseers and the master of a workhouse.

6. Within these limitations the overseers should be allowed [later Hanway wrote "required "] to send all their children.

7. A certificate of baptism should be given to the person bringing the child in order that it might be identified and reclaimed.

8. During the fourth month of the year, anyone producing a receipt for a child and one shilling should be told if it was still alive.

9. Registers of entrances, deaths, etc. should be kept not only by the hospital but also by the parish.

10. At four, a child should be reclaimable by a parent who would pay five shillings and show power to support it.⁵⁹

None of Hanway's recommendations was original, but they were all sensible.

Handicapped as they had been, the Governors seem to have succeeded in their work beyond any reasonable expectation, and the public might be supposed to have been eager to adopt such sane suggestions and to increase the value of the hospital. But stories of mismanagement, deaths and expense had made the Foundling notorious. Men were not willing to consider the merits of the institution; they demanded that it be closed before it ruined the country financially and morally. In March 1760, therefore, Parliament decided to bring admissions to an end, and the last child was baptized as Kitty Finis. While the thousands of children already

⁵⁹ *Candid Account*, 92ff.

admitted were to be supported until they could earn their own living, the Government urged the hospital authorities to get them apprenticed as quickly as possible, for the nation wanted this experiment to be ended.

Now when Hanway had had his goods seized in Persia, when he was alone among enemies and thousands of miles from home, he had followed his property for days on a scarecrow nag until he could recover what was his own and do what he had set out to accomplish. In 1760 he was equally determined that if the public would not save the lives of children in one way they must do so in another. The most that he could do at this time was to lobby through Parliament an Act (2 George III, c. 22) requiring the parishes, beginning July 1st, 1762, to keep records of the children admitted to their workhouses. Men objected that these institutions customarily kept detailed records and that an Act was unnecessary, but Hanway knew better; he thought that an official report would be the means of saving five hundred lives annually. This was a conservative estimate; knowing that overseers did not want workhouse infants to live, the poor came to call it "the Act for keeping poor children alive." The next chapter will show why.

Two pamphlets replying to Hanway's *Candid Account* indicate the widespread antagonism to the work of the hospital. The anonymous and rhetorical author of the *Rise and Progress of the Foundling Hospital* (1761), besides making the usual criticisms of its procedure, stated flatly that the number of deaths among children of the poor had been grossly exaggerated, because those not accounted for and supposed dead had been returned to their parents. If one granted this (and everyone knew that the workhouse served as the maternity hospital for the very poor), the workhouse had saved as large a proportion of its children as had the Foundling, and the increased appropriations from Parliament for their benefit had been wasted. Furthermore, the death rate of the hospital would have been much higher if it had included those who had died on the way to it. The first statement was not true, as Hanway had demonstrated. As for the second, he too had

suggested that only London children should be admitted. The pamphlet required no answer.

Hanway did, however, reply directly to C—— A——, whose *Candid Remarks* . . .⁶⁰ (1760) accused the Governors of taking part in a "sinister design" to promote vice and licentiousness, a charge which must have astounded the sober Londoners who knew them. C—— A—— was scandalized at a relationship which he read into the fact that many of the hospital's Governors had been founders of the new Magdalen House, for the Foundling seemed to him a means of alleviating just punishment for vice in that it cared for the fruits, while the Magdalen was designed to restore virtue. Hanway had published his approval of both institutions. The kindest possible implication of C—— A——'s pamphlet was that Hanway was an irresponsible theorist whose right hand worked in opposition to his left, a well-meaning philanthropist who did immeasurable harm.

C—— A—— was alarmed that virtuous people should tolerate a Foundling Hospital in their midst :

If we reflect upon the late efforts that were made to extend the Lying-in Hospital for married women to women of all denominations, seemingly to annihilate those two divine guards to female innocence, shame and timidity, faster and more effectually than the Foundling Hospital alone could destroy them, and if we attend to the doctrines that have been publicly propagated in favour of concubinage as preferable to marriage, and that half of the human species—viz. the females—should only be considered as gentlemen consider their brood mares, or as country squires do their game hens or their bitches to breed on, and that as nature does not furnish females enough in the proportion she usually observes to satisfy their sinful lusts, the State ought to import quantities of them from abroad, that men of such sinful inclinations may increase the number of whores in the kingdom . . . indicate seem-

⁶⁰ *Candid Remarks on Mr. Hanway's Candid Historical Account of the Foundling Hospital, and a more Useful Plan Humbly Recommended, in a Letter to a Member of Parliament. The second edition, with additions. To Which is Added a Rejoinder to Mr. Hanway's Reply to the Above Remarks, by C—— A——* (1760).

ingly . . . a sinister design . . . which ought in reality to alarm our apprehensions and awaken our fears if we prefer virtue, order, decency, population and government to vice, disorder, licentiousness, depopulation and ruin.⁶¹

Any project for the poor must be directed toward ends which the nation would find desirable.

In his fulminations C—— A—— expressed many of the common beliefs which new developments in charity were undermining. The objects of such institutions as the hospital, as he saw them, were to diminish the Poor Rate by making the indigent self-supporting and to increase the nation's manufactures and trade. His observation was that the healthy workman laboured only in proportion to his wants, and therefore even the Poor Laws "encouraged sloth and hurt industry" by providing support in old age or misfortune, thus removing one of the incentives to labour. If the public continued to support the offspring of the shiftless, the poor would then be forced to work neither for themselves nor for others, which was "repugnant to the interest of a commercial nation." By the system of workhouses, however, the local magistrate could determine how many of his children to leave with the labourer in order to get the most from his industry without driving him to sickness or despair. Hanway's accounts of "killing nurses" and the workhouse dead were merely an impudent attempt to diminish the parish rates by shifting the burden and the bother to the whole nation. That parish officers saved the lives of their charges in some parishes was proof that they could do so in all if they chose. The real import of Hanway's book, therefore, was that country gentlemen should mortgage their estates in order to support a swarm of improvident mendicants who would thus be enabled to be comfortably useless.

C—— A—— contended that, for the country as a whole, the system of workhouses was a blessing. The overseer, intent on preserving the parish funds, vigilantly supervised the activity of the poor and kept them to their duty. This vigilance reduced the number of paupers to a minimum,

⁶¹ *Candid Remarks*, 9-10.

because self-interest prevented a parish from maintaining more than it must. The overseers proved their work in the care they exercised against receiving poor families into their districts and in their general zeal to move both transients and inhabitants elsewhere. Hanway himself had admitted that there were good officers in Westminster. Why were there not also good ones in London? If the workhouses were small, why not build larger ones? If they were dirty, why not clean them? If, against all probability, a hospital should prove successful in preserving a larger number of infants, then C—— A—— commented that these would be unhealthy city children from the stews, for which sober, diligent country folk must provide care and maintenance.

In conclusion C—— A—— expressed a hope that the country would learn its lesson from the current muddled thinking and return to the iron discipline which would not only meet the true needs but also produce a moral reformation.

Should this labyrinth of difficulties lead the State to abolish our Poor Laws and with them our parish contests about settlements, and convert these several secret asylums for bastards, &c. into open and public workhouses for the truly necessitous poor, and should they build others in the kingdom upon waste lands, and guard them by proper powers (. . . not only against all secret but against all open admittance, when such open admittance may possibly or even probably lessen the aggregate quantity of industry), . . . thence industry, which is the soul of a commercial nation, would revive, the poor would then labour for themselves and for futurity when convinced they must otherwise labour for the State.

Concurrently the laws should be rigorously enforced, thus restoring order and virtuous ways of living.

Hanway's *Reply to C—— A——*⁶² was probably written

⁶² *A Reply to C—— A——, Author of the Candid Remarks on Mr. Hanway's Candid Historical Account of the Foundling Hospital, with Relation to the Probable Advantages of this Institution, if Confined to such Foundlings, Orphans, and Deserted Children, within the Bills of Mortality, as Were Usually Sent to Parish Workhouses and Parish Nurses* (1760).

a few days after he saw the pamphlet and realized that it expressed opinions which were widely held. His brief answer reveals that, while both C—— A—— and he wished to achieve much the same ends, the philanthropists he represented believed that the best method of benefiting the nation as a whole was through consideration of the needs of the poor rather than through a refusal to change a system which was ineffective; there was no “juncto” or “plot against the State,” either by the officers of the hospital or by those of the parish. Hanway stressed the welfare and necessities of the child, such as pure air and mother’s milk, and measured the workhouse against the Foundling as a means of preserving life. While both had difficulty in getting good nurses, the hospital had the advantage in that it boarded them (which the parish did not) and paid them twice as much. The final proof of merit, however, was that on the same basis for estimate the hospital preserved forty-four per cent of its children and the workhouse less than eight—seldom more than four. In regard to the number of poor, if self-interest and avarice influenced overseers to drive the indigent away from their doors, the results must be vicious and not beneficial.

C—— A—— had been too ardent in the defence of his beliefs to be quieted by this temperate and courteous retort. His *Rejoinder* extended his original arguments and finally rested on the statement that the issue

. . . is not whether this or that scheme preserves most infants, but it is whether the present plan of our Poor Laws . . . or the new plan of a [Foundling] Hospital which you now offer . . . will be less injurious to the community.

Perhaps C—— A—— expressed the general opinion of the public; at any rate Parliament ceased to support the hospital in March 1760.

In his efforts to increase the utility of the Foundling Hospital, to which he had devoted much time and effort, Hanway met defeat. True, the organization continued as a private institution and he continued to work with it, but public esteem for it had decreased and its usefulness had been curtailed. More than that, philanthropists were to hear

reverberations of the disaster for years, because a sceptical public became suspicious that all plans were equally enthusiastic and therefore hesitated to contribute funds to other enterprises. Yet out of his initial failure Hanway could have culled many observations which were to prove valuable to him :

1. There was an obvious need to develop all philanthropy.

2. The poor could not improve their lot without aid.

3. Numbers of men and women were able and willing to engage in "political humanity," and he knew them.

4. These people would oppose any scheme which did not stress industry, self-dependence, and subordination of spirit among the poor.

5. Private societies were more efficient than the government : (a) Taxpayers would not generally support charity ; and (b) they were unsympathetic to error and waste.

6. A charity lived on the good will of the public. Therefore (a) misapprehensions of policy must be painstakingly and repeatedly corrected ; (b) difficulties encountered must be frankly discussed ; and (c) successes attained must be continually published.

7. The chief obstacle to philanthropy was the lack of an orderly administration which would maintain the confidence of the public ; the officers must not proceed to measures which the public did not understand and approve.

These were the principles on which Hanway wrote his succeeding volumes, and men knew that he laboured in good will, restrained by good judgment.

II

Parliament had promised to maintain the five thousand children who had been admitted to the Foundling Hospital before 1760 until some other provision could be made for them. Hanway thought that they should not all be kept in the hospital, for to be segregated over a period of years with five thousand of their kind would be the worst possible train-

ing for any boy or girl.⁶³ There was also greater danger of disease in keeping so many infants together, especially as they were crowded into quarters which had been designed to shelter one-third their number. If they were dispersed immediately into small colonies or placed individually with nurses whose husbands were sober and industrious, this peril could be minimized. The best solution, however, would be to find a permanent home for each child.

No matter how urgently Parliament insisted that all children should be apprenticed, many were still in their infancy and could not be bound to a master for several years. If the government supported them until they were eleven, the cost of their maintenance would total £120,000; if the girls were kept to the age of thirteen the country must spend £150,000. Even then Parliament would find it advisable to give each master an apprenticeship fee. Heretofore the hospital had been able to place six per cent of its wards without any fee, because they received better than average education, but thousands of children could not expect to get good masters unless the usual fee was given. The masters would consider themselves deprived of money which custom granted them as a right.⁶⁴ If a sum was given, youths would receive better treatment, but the cost to Parliament would greatly increase.

The more Hanway puzzled over these problems the more he believed that their sensible solution was to apprentice the children at an earlier age, to increase the fee, and to pay it as soon as the papers had been signed. At first he suggested that £9 be given to a master taking a small boy and £12 to one taking a little girl. Then a correspondent proposed that 40s. be given annually for four years, with a bonus of 40s. payable when the child could read.⁶⁵ Hanway accepted the

⁶³ Hanway, *Proposals for a Saving to the Public* (1760), and *A Proposal for Saving £70,000 to £150,000 to the Public: at the Same Time Rendering 5,000 Young Persons of Both Sexes More Happy* (1764); hereafter referred to as *Proposal for Saving*. The first of these I have been unable to find, but there is little doubt that the second repeats its essential details.

⁶⁴ *Appeal for Mercy*, 101-5.

⁶⁵ Postscript to the *Proposal for Saving*.

amendment immediately, for this method would enable inspectors to supervise the masters and make sure that all the children were not only kept alive but also taught to knit, to darn, and to say their prayers, and that the girls were taught to sew and to mend. Masters would have an incentive to train their children carefully, thus assuring their self-dependence after the period of apprenticeship had been served. Furthermore, the master's standard of living would be raised, for £9 would supply most of the necessities for his family for a year. The total cost of placing all the children by this method would be £52,500, less by £70,000 to £100,000 than for simple maintenance in the hospital. The government, the masters and the children would all profit.⁶⁶

All Hanway's argument in favour of his plan had little effect. The Governors either did not believe in it or they did not believe Parliament would adopt it. In 1765 a committee recommended to the Commons that £5 to £10 fees be granted in order to get the children apprenticed immediately, because the training did not fit them for a future of arduous labour. A Bill was thereupon introduced, read once, and dropped as the session ended.

Some objections to Hanway's plan grew from a general belief that the fund was unlikely to be properly administered. Everyone was familiar with the type of master who made a business of taking apprentices in consideration of the fee, and then later drove the youth from his employ by abuse. (Many men did not earn more than £9 a year.) With the proposed fees, doubtless so many masters would apply for apprentices that the officers would be unable to investigate characters and reputations, or partiality might be shown to favourites. The fact that from time to time Governors of the Foundling prosecuted guardians of foundlings for cruelties ranging up to murder demonstrated the necessity of supervision for any plan.⁶⁷

Gradually the inmates of the Foundling diminished in number as the children reached ages of seven to thirteen. At

⁶⁶ *Proposal for Saving, passim.*

⁶⁷ Nichols and Wray, *History*, 190-3.

least half of them were apprenticed from the branch hospital at Ackworth into the Yorkshire cloth mills. Here manufacturers taking boys and girls of seven to nine years were paid £5 per annum "nursing money"; they found the arrangement so desirable that they applied for groups of fifty apprentices at a time. In April 1768 Hanway reported to the committee of the hospital that twenty-two of seventy-four apprenticed to Mr. Martin Brown of Holbeck, near Leeds, had died in the one year. The children were then removed from Mr. Brown's care and sent for a time to the Holbeck workhouse.⁶⁸ If Hanway's own plan had been adopted incidents like this would not have occurred.

The heated discussions which raged in contemporary pamphlets concerning the Foundling Hospital seem to have left little mark on more polite literature. Colonel Jack struggled upward before the charity was organized; Tom Jones and Humphry Clinker were born in the country. Perhaps in the eighteenth century the reading public was too little familiar with the waif in an institution to make a novel based on that life a cause for sympathy. As these orphans learned to read and grew to manhood, and as more people interested themselves in work among the poor, thousands were ready to follow the lives of *Oliver Twist*, *Little Dorrit* and *Nicholas Nickleby*, and to judge the incidents on the printed page in the light of personal experience.

⁶⁸ Nichols and Wray, *History*, 187-90.

CHAPTER III

THE WORKHOUSE

IN 1760, when the Foundling Hospital stopped the indiscriminate admission of infants, most men, whether favourably or unfavourably disposed toward it, settled back in their chairs, concluding that the public was flatly opposed to the expense of measures necessary to keep poor children alive. From about 1700 to 1756 their fathers had found the make-shift workhouses adequate; nothing more could be done, for Parliament had refused to continue the costly experiment.

Hanway, however, persisted in his belief that the basic problem of caring for pauper children had not been solved; if workhouse management had been previously unsatisfactory, at least men could now insist that it be more efficient and less wasteful than the hospital had been. After all, were the parish workhouses more effectual than the Foundling, or did their merit lie in the fact that their death-rate and their expense were not published?

No investigation could convince any man that the workhouse was either healthful or economical, and as Hanway went into the slums he soon realized that his contemporaries "practice that towards infants which any man of sentiment would deem cruelty to a dog or cat."¹ In keeping with his character he busied himself at getting a complete record of the facts in order that his conclusions and his recommendations should be just, businesslike and final. As he explored he wrote books to inform others of his discoveries and to discuss the proposals for reform which seemed most likely to prove efficacious.

After Parliament withdrew its support from the Foundling Hospital, people rather naturally extended their prejudice against this institution to all attempts at reform, particularly those concerning children. Men wanted to hear no more about bastards and foundlings. Hanway's first task, therefore,

¹ Hanway, *Letters on the Rising Generation*, I, 29-30.

was to get a basis for comparison between the results at the hospital from 1756 to 1760 and those at the workhouse, both in the years preceding and in those following, for if he could convince men that the records of the parishes were the worse, he might direct this general wrath against the workhouse, especially if its record continued to be as deplorable as he was sure it must be.

Everybody knew that the pauper had reason for his horror of the workhouse, and while Hanway's facts were specific their general import was not new. Some men must always have had data sufficiently exact to force a reform, but few either desired it or thought that it was possible. The death rate of London children had been notorious for generations. In a sermon on the Education of Children² Archbishop Tillotson had commented that scarce one infant in five survived the first year of life, in towns and villages around London, where the more wealthy placed their babies with wet nurses. Addison had thought that it was barbarous of the fair sex to entrust their offspring to strange nurses whose tenderness was proportionate to their wages.³ Perhaps the custom of the century can best be illustrated through a few of the examples cited by Hanway.

He was surprised to discover that the county of Middlesex had experimented in 1686 with a plan similar in some respects to that of the Foundling.⁴ In this year the parish officers prepared a house for the reception of children on payment of fees, sums varying in amount according to the kind of rearing, education and apprenticeship which the parent or guardian desired and was able to afford. This project seemed such a worthy one to many citizens that, with the consent of the Middlesex officers, they procured an order for other parishes to send a proportion of their poor to this house. The parish of St. Clement Danes, however, refused to obey the command when its officers discovered that the cost of supporting five children would amount to 2s. 6d. more per week than

² John Tillotson, *Works*, ed. Thomas Birch (1820), III, 490.

³ *Spectator*, No. 246.

⁴ *Letters on the Rising Generation*, I, 48-60.

its overseers then paid. This refusal elicited an Order of Sessions that a committee should examine the care of the poor in St. Clement Danes, over the preceding seven years, to determine what justification, if any, the parish might have for its action. The facts collected by this committee furnished Hanway with an account of children's care by parishes in the years preceding the institution of workhouses.

The examining group reported that in 1679 there had been 89 children supported by the parish of St. Clement Danes and that in the succeeding years 110 more had been received, a total of 199. Of this number 67 had been foundlings. Between 1679 and 1686 the officers had apprenticed 55 of whom 32 were then alive. In 1686 the parish had 58 children in its charge. In analysing these figures the committee observed that 90 had lived but that 109 children had either died or their names were fictitious ones written on the books for the profit of overseers. Of the 67 foundlings 51 had died, and so had 23 of the 55 grown children who had been apprenticed. The latter number of deaths, the examiners believed, was twice as high as the general average for the same age within the bills of mortality. While the care at St. Clement's was obviously inadequate, the report led to no action. As interest in the experiment declined the officers failed to meet expenses; the house was closed and eventually sold to the Quakers.

From the figures of the committee's report Hanway illustrated one of the chief difficulties of reform by local government. Men who paid the taxes looked at the total sum spent on relief and thought that the parish had been lavish in its care, when in point of fact the amount expended could not have provided more than one-third of the necessities of life. The hard-headed taxpayers would know that in seven years St. Clement Danes had spent £1,943 9s. for nursing and £109 8s. in apprentice fees, a total of £2,052 17s.; besides £2,708 16s. 5d. which the officers had given away in "extraordinary charges," some of which must have been devoted to the children. Citizens were naturally angry at such totals, especially in view of the general belief that in saving any of

the children they were only adding to their future burden. Men assumed that the progeny of paupers would develop into beggars and thieves.

So Hanway continued the analysis of figures. Ninety infants had lived. Counting deaths and late arrivals, Hanway supposed that the average number in the house at any one time had not exceeded one hundred, or half the total of the seven years. For this number the annual cost per child was £2 16s. plus whatever share it may have had in the total extraordinary expenses. The Middlesex Justices at the time, however, had believed that 3s. a week (£7 16s. a year) was a reasonable expenditure if the child was to survive. Seventy years later Parliament appropriated £7 10s. for each infant admitted to the Foundling. By their own figures and regardless of intent, the officers of St. Clement Danes had starved their wards.

Hanway found perhaps his best illustration, an object lesson on both actual conditions and current social conscience, in the investigation into parish care of the poor conducted by the House of Commons in March, 1715.⁵ A committee had been appointed to collect data. Since the object of the inquiry was to inform the House as to the most effective way of caring for the indigent, this committee chose the parish of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, known as one of the most charitable and best regulated, and went into its business and methods in detail. Although St. Martin's had an excellent reputation as a "good" parish, the committee found every reason to believe that half of the money collected for the poor was embezzled, that both this money and that given to the church was stolen or disbursed at extortionate prices, that the evident miseries of the poor were given as an excuse to collect money for other purposes, that haphazard accounting made any check on the officers impossible, and that these last allowed the paupers to starve and to be murdered in complete indifference to their fate. The committee's first conclusion was that the whole system of parish relief needed to be regulated.

⁵ *Journals of the House of Commons*, XVIII, 392ff.

Examining the parish books for 1712, 1713 and 1714 the committee discovered that an average of £5,700 was "distributed to the poor" each year. The names of those persons receiving aid were tabulated, but the number was so great that the investigators were forced to accept the officers' word that the list was an honest one and the names not fictitious. One-third of the money went to relieve the "casual" poor (those who had no claim to a settlement, but who could be given temporary aid more cheaply than they could be transported), and another disproportionate amount was lumped together under "extraordinaries." Yet relief for the individual was neither quick nor adequate. During the preceding winter (1714-15) the parish had collected a large sum for the benefit of those suffering from the unusually severe cold but, though it was then March, the money had not yet been distributed and "multitudes" of the indigent had starved or frozen to death, as the bills of mortality proved. About three-fourths of the twelve hundred babies born in the parish each year died within the year of their birth, possibly from the "unwholesome air." Furthermore,

. . . a great many poor infants and exposed bastard children are inhumanly suffered to die by the barbarity of nurses, especially parish nurses, who are a sort of people void of commiseration or religion hired by the churchwardens to take off a burthen from the parish at the cheapest and easiest rates they can; and these know the manner of doing it effectually, as by the burial books may evidently appear . . .⁶

While the primary function of the officers was to maintain order by suppressing beggars and vagrants, those of St. Martin's encouraged offenders because these frequented a tippling house kept by the beadle. Neither the poor nor the parish derived much benefit from the sums collected in the Poor's Rate.

Whether the money was taken from the sums collected for the poor, or from those levied for other purposes, the officers seemed neither careful nor honest in spending parish money

⁶ *Journals of the House of Commons*, XVIII, 396.

for any of its needs. In three years churchwardens and overseers had spent £5,481 10s. 4d. for the parish itself, two-thirds of which the committee thought had been wasted. For example, whatever the church purchased was "bought at the worst hand and paid for at extravagant rates, because the persons who furnish their goods or their work are, for the most part, such as have been churchwardens and vestrymen."⁷ John Eddridge, Clerk of the Vestry, had requisitioned over £832 from the poor's and parish money, which seemed unreasonable, if not fraudulent.

As the Parliamentary Committee investigated, they suspected that the church was kept in repair by money collected for the use of the poor, rather than by funds assessed to maintain the church property. Officers of the church made no examination as to the amounts collected through the offertories, and the committee thought that large sums were being diverted to private profit.

As the committee perused the books showing the taxes collected, they concluded that the account there set down had been falsified. Because many of the people reported on the sheets as delinquent were commonly known to own property the committee believed that much of the sum in tax arrears had been paid by citizens to the officers and pocketed by them, and then the items had been written off the books as uncollectable. In support of this charge the group cited the testimony of Peter Hill, a former overseer, who stated that the poor fund had shown a surplus of £300 in 1698 and £220 in 1699, money which should have been entrusted to the succeeding overseer, but which had been demanded by and paid to the Vestry. In 1705, knowing of this surplus, he had refused to pay his share of an additional assessment for the poor, whereupon the churchwardens, vestrymen, a constable, two collectors and a beadle of a distant ward "did distrain a silver pepper box out of his house," which they kept until his rate had been paid. The parish assessed dissenters and Frenchmen, but these received nothing for the maintenance of their poor.

⁷ *Journals of the House of Commons*, XVIII, 396.

The Commons might have expected that the church vestry would reform parish business, but they discovered that when a churchwarden went out of office he was himself customarily elected a vestryman. In this position he audited the accounts of his successor, whom he would be unlikely to restrain in offences of which he himself had been guilty. Once the parish administration became corrupt, therefore, the chief hope of reform lay in the superior power of Parliament.

Realizing the necessity of thorough regulation as they digested the report on this "good" parish, the Commons brought in a Bill which would embody the recommendations proposed by the committee of inquiry. Money to support the poor was to be raised by a special tax. The Bill met objection in the Commons from the cow keepers of Southwark, who petitioned against any added rates and were thereupon exempted from assessment. In the Lords the Bill was opposed by the clergymen of London and Westminster and by the trustees of certain charity schools, who found that the provisions would be detrimental to established philanthropy. After this second petition the Bill was thrown out, no reform was attempted, and Hanway found exactly the same conditions prevailing in London fifty years later.

Workhouses were set up by most London parishes in the first quarter of the century. Founded upon excellent motives and begun with high hope of solving the problem of the poor forever,⁸ these homes almost invariably followed much the same course as that of the one in St. Mary Matfelon (St. Mary Whitechapel). In 1733 a Mr. Phillips from that parish testified to the Commons that

. . . there is a workhouse in the parish, which will contain two hundred poor, but is situated in a back street adjoining to a white-lead house, and is a dirty place, there being no yard or any room to erect a warehouse to put goods in : That the first year after the same was erected, it was regulated, and the poor therein maintained at 1s. 6d. per week each ; but, since the vestry have had the management thereof, the expense is increased to 4s. per week

⁸Sir F. M. Eden, *State of the Poor*, *passim*.

each; and is occasioned by the officers of the parish, who are tradesmen, and promote their several trades without having any regard of buying provisions and other necessities at the lowest price: That at present there are about thirty poor therein, who are not kept to work but go and come as they please, get drunk, and are disorderly: That an attempt was made to set them to work, but people would not trust them with their goods.⁹

While the elections in the vestry were open to all who paid the Poor's Rates, the meetings were so disorderly that they frequently had to be adjourned, and Dr. Shippen of St. Mary's had been publicly given the lie.

To a long-suffering public the success of a parish officer was measured, firstly, by his economy and, secondly, by his ability to rid the district of paupers and vagrants. One result was that the poor could never enter a child in the workhouse if its subsistence could be otherwise arranged. The child or adult, once entered, the parish intended that he should find living there so unpleasant that he would seize upon any other means of support in order to get out, warning others against succumbing to the same misfortune. Always the story was the same:

The officers . . . have been so negligent . . . that some infants have been suffered to perish with cold and hunger in the streets, without any attempt for their relief; and few who are brought to the parish officers do long survive under the care of a parish nurse or workhouse . . .¹⁰

Those who lived became a "burden to themselves" and "a reproach to their country."¹¹

Overseers customarily accepted any bastard into the workhouse upon payment of fees ranging from £5 to £10. Smollett's readers knew that Jery Melford was following custom when, on the advice of Mr. Bramble, he wrote to Sir Watkins Phillips to compound with the parish for the child of Miss Blackerby. When Jery angrily denied his paternity Mr. Bramble was amused as well as sympathetic, for between

⁹ *Journals of the House of Commons*, XXII, 271.

¹⁰ Hanway, *Account of the Hospital*, iii.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

the ages of twenty and forty the "old gentleman . . . had been obliged to provide for nine bastards, sworn to him by women whom he never saw."¹² In charging only £5 to £10 the overseers admitted that the child would not live over one year, because its annual cost to the parish would be £6 or £7. Furthermore, as these sums were largely pocketed by the officer as "expenses of taking in," the actual life expectancy was much less than a year.¹³ In point of fact Hanway's figures show that the child might live thirty days,¹⁴ a truth which may in part have accounted for Dr. Johnson's recent anger at the brutality of Savage's "parents."¹⁵

Because some officers disliked saying that "All our children are dead,"¹⁶ even Hanway had difficulty in discovering the fate of children after they entered the workhouse and, of course, no one could determine how many were killed outright either there or by the parish nurses. In referring to the mortality lists Hanway noted in his *Candid Account* that the number of infants "overlaid" (for which he read "stifled") since 1729 rose from 71 to 133 each year, and then declined to 21 or 22. He did not believe the latter improvement was due to various frames invented and sold to parents desiring to keep nurses on their own side of the bed, but rather to a greater sobriety in nurses, which allowed them to be more careful. The "declension of gin is the rise of the human species in this island." Although parish workhouses "used to put eight infants in a bed together . . . where they wallowed in their own filth during the few days of misery which they lived,"¹⁷ officers now provided better facilities. Nevertheless, the bills of mortality from 1728 to 1758 revealed that 58 per cent of the children born and christened in London lived less than two years. Hanway believed that country homes, better houses and wider streets had improved public health in the 'forties and 'fifties, as demonstrated by the fact that the rate

¹² *Humphry Clinker*, Bath, April 24th.

¹³ Hanway, *Appeal for Mercy*, 38.

¹⁴ Cf. Hanway's analysis of parish registers as given on pages 62ff. of this chapter.

¹⁵ *The Life of Richard Savage in Works*, *passim*.

¹⁶ Hanway, *Account of the Hospital*, iii.

¹⁷ Hanway, *Candid Account*, 75.

at which deaths exceeded births in London was falling for the first time since the reign of Elizabeth.

As a measure of public health Hanway thought that parish overseers might have been expected to relieve the crowded workhouses by granting aid in homes to the numbers of women whose poverty forced them to bear their children in workhouses. Numbers of infants were thus born every year because few other places were open to the poor and these few were rigorously guarded against common use. In the midst of workhouse paupers and petty criminals bickering to get all they could of the inadequate provisions, and subjected to the pervading itch and scrofula, a woman might give birth to her child. She might even keep it alive if she left soon enough!

The poor had reason for their belief that "parish officers never intend that parish infants should live,"¹⁸ for an acquaintance of Hanway's

. . . once solicited a parish officer for two shillings a week for a servant during her lying-in and nursing her child; alleging that a common parish nurse had at least that sum, if not 2s. 6d. "Yes," says the officer, "it is very true; but the young woman in question will most probably preserve her child, whereas in the hands of our nurses after five or six weeks we hear no more of them."¹⁹

To the overseer the poor were not only worthless in themselves but they were also a hazard to his success. While he might not actually kill them, he could arrange that they should not live.

Hanway found that the workhouses had been uniformly murderous. He devoted his *Serious Considerations on the Parish Poor* (1762) to exposing the old, evil ways and to advising on the best procedure in workhouses which intended to preserve life. These were timely warnings, for since 1760 the officers were again receiving infants which they could not take to the Foundling Hospital. In dozens of books and pamphlets Hanway named those men and women who were guilty of offence and praised those who were efficient; he published statistics and called for reforms.

¹⁸ Hanway, *Letters on the Rising Generation*, I, 100.

¹⁹ *Appeal for Mercy*, 39.

To the tender-hearted or the complacent these books could not have been pleasant. Hanway discovered that some years before the hospital had opened, a parish had taken in fifty-four children, not one of whom outlived the year it was received at the workhouse. The building was "airy and well situated, but such was their nursing!"²⁰ An overseer of one of the larger parishes declared in open court that his house had preserved no child in fourteen years.²¹ St. Luke's Middlesex had received fifty-three in five years, and not one lived.²² Another parish had saved not even one out of one hundred children received annually over a period of twenty years:

The reason was plain—in a house which could not conveniently accommodate two hundred persons, three hundred of the lowest kind of people were brought together; and a great number of them old, sickly, or in a filthy condition: how could . . . the poor infant . . . open his mouth without sucking in mortality?²³

St. Martin-in-the-Fields had never been known to save a child. In one workhouse eleven out of one hundred and seventy-four admitted lived to the age of two months. Another house had accepted two thousand children over a period of twenty-eight years, and not one survived. To the general overcrowding the nurses, like the mother of Count Fathom, added gin or narcotic sleeping potions, and the sooner a baby died the less it suffered. Mrs. Brownrigg, hanged in the 'sixties for beating to death an apprentice in the maternity house, had been a parish nurse. While this was the record of the workhouses, pamphleteers claimed these institutions had saved more lives than the Foundling Hospital.

In 1761, to compare the record of the workhouse and that of the hospital for equal periods of time, Hanway examined the parish registers of London covering the years from 1750

²⁰ Hanway, *Appeal for Mercy*, 9.

²¹ Hanway, *Serious Considerations on the Salutary Design of the Act of Parliament for a Regular, Uniform Register of the Parish-Poor in All the Parishes within the Bills of Mortality* (1762), 11; hereafter referred to as *Serious Considerations on the Parish Poor*.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ Hanway, *Candid Account*, 85-6.

through 1755. The following table shows the "effectiveness" of workhouses in the fourteen largest parishes. "Received" meant children admitted who were too young to be apprentices. "Discharged" included infants born in the workhouses and released with their mothers after a month or six weeks of residence, plus a few for whom relatives or friends decided to provide.

		Born and Received	Discharged	Dead	Alive in 1755
St. George, Hanover Square	...	288	115	137	36
St. Luke, Middlesex	...	53	—	53	—
St. Giles-in-the-Fields and St. George, Bloomsbury	...	415	228	169	18
St. Andrew above Bars and St. George the Martyr	...	284	57	222	5
St. Ann, Westminster	...	66	30	28	8
St. Saviour, Southwark	...	156	91	56	9
St. Paul, Shadwell	...	32	11	12	9
St. Martin-in-the-Fields	...	312	147	158	7
St. Margaret and St. John, West- minster	...	129	32	68	29
Lambeth	...	76	53	23	—
Christ Church, Surrey	...	39	19	18	2
St. Giles without Cripplegate	...	209	131	62	16
St. Botolph without Aldgate	...	119	57	33	29
St. James, Westminster	...	161	103	58	—
Total, 1750 to 1755	...	2,339	1,074	1,077 ²⁴	168 ²⁵

The 1,074 children who had been discharged Hanway dismissed from consideration, for nothing was known of them after their departure. Subtracting these, therefore, from the total, he observed that of the 1,245 children remaining in the workhouses only 168 had lived and 1,077 had died—a death rate he calculated at 88 per cent.

But Hanway assured his readers that these figures were too optimistic to be taken as final. Since the ages of entrants

²⁴ 1,097 is the correct total of the "Dead" column. Hanway's figures are used because this is an account of his story to the people of London.

²⁵ Hanway, *Appeal for Mercy*, 67-8; also *Letters on the Rising Generation*, I, 80-1.

were not given and some must have been beyond the really dangerous period of infancy, the actual probability of death was even greater than his table would lead one to suppose. Furthermore, from his observation Hanway was forced to conclude that the workhouse children alive in 1755 were those who had been admitted that same year, possibly within the last two or three months. Indeed, if one could trace these infants through the next few years he might discover that none of them had lived to be apprenticed.²⁶ Hanway reminded his readers that some parishes publicly acknowledged that no infant had ever lived to be apprenticed from their workhouses.

By these figures Hanway revealed that the record of the workhouses, prior to the order for general admission to the Foundling Hospital, left small room for hope that infants would be tenderly nourished now that they had once again been entrusted to the care of overseers. The citizenry would be partially responsible for this infanticide unless they insisted upon a rigorous discipline of parish institutions. In *Serious Considerations on the Salutary Design of the Act of Parliament for a Regular, Uniform Register of the Parish-Poor* (1762) Hanway recommended that overseers endeavour to keep the poor out of workhouses both by appealing to their sense of shame and by encouraging them to greater industry in self-support. Those admitted should then be well treated. Despite the fact that the poor were likely to impose on the

²⁶ *Journals of the House of Commons*, XXXI, 248-9 (March 24th, 1767). From the report of Mr. Whitworth for the committee of the Commons to investigate the state of the parish poor within the bills of mortality:

"1st, That taking the children born in workhouses, or parish houses, or received of and under twelve months old in the year 1763, and following the same into 1764 and 1765, only seven in a hundred appear to have survived this short period.

"2ndly, That having called for the registers of the years 1754, 1755, 1761 and 1762, of the children placed out as apprentices by the parishes within the bills of mortality, it appears that there have been apprenticed out the number of 1,419; but upon examining the ages at which the said children so placed out were received, in the seven years from 1741 till they grew up to be placed out, it appears that only nineteen of those born in the workhouses, or received into them under twelve months old, compose any part of the 1,419; and even of those received as far as three years old, only thirty-six appear to have survived in the hands of the said parishes to be placed out apprentice."

credulity of officers if small sums were dispensed each week to complete the amount necessary to their support, Hanway argued that this system not only encouraged the individual to greater efforts in his own behalf but also allowed families to make themselves more useful to the nation by rearing numbers of children.²⁷

While the workhouses prepared to receive children again two parishes made changes which elicited Hanway's praise: St. Andrew's broke its custom of saving money at the expense of human life by electing the lowest bidder to office as overseer, and St. Martin-in-the-Fields gave a premium to nurses whose charges were alive after a stated period.²⁸ Hanway objected to the axiom that a good woman would keep a child alive and a bad one would not, regardless of reward, for this "proves nothing, or a great deal too much." Eventually, if the public discovered that parish officers could or would not keep children alive by their own methods and still opposed suggestions which might succeed, some way must be found to force them to be humane.²⁹

After 1763 Hanway was greatly aided by provisions in the Act (2 George III, c. 22) which he had induced Parliament to pass. The Act required each parish clerk, beginning July 1st, 1762, to keep an annual record showing the names of all children under four years of age in the workhouse on January 1st of each year, the date on which each was received, the nurse to whom entrusted and the date each died or was discharged. Under the Act the Company of Parish Clerks printed and bound abstracts of these annual reports and then presented six copies to each parish clerk or to the churchwarden. After January 1st, 1763, therefore, Hanway had recourse to the current record in the workhouses as revealed by the parish officers themselves.

As these annual reports were made Hanway commented on them in letters to the newspapers. By 1766 parish registers showed plainly that all the old, haphazard practices had been

²⁷ Hanway, *Serious Considerations on the Parish Poor*, 45.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 19.

²⁹ *Letters on the Rising Generation*, I, xvi-xvii.

resumed, and Hanway had collected sufficient facts and figures to bring out his two best books, *An Earnest Appeal for Mercy* (1766) and *Letters on the Rising Generation* (1767). Though experience had taught him that the public might be captious in their regard for the poor, what he had seen made him determine that some reform must be attempted. He had the records and, furthermore, despite warnings of probable violence he himself had been into the slums. There, he wrote, he had "frequently escaped infection from bad air by means of a sponge with vinegar, the smell of rue, or a plug of tobacco in my nose; and in the open air by keeping to the windward of the filthy object."³⁰

In these books Hanway made every effort to be fair and restrained, lest an appearance of enthusiasm defeated his purpose. He was especially concerned, however, that Englishmen should not delude themselves as to the results of their charity "with expectations or promises which clash with experience and demonstration":

If you exert your native generosity, so far from con-
 niving at the destruction of your fellow citizens because
 they are poor and in the helpless state [in] which the God
 of nature first places all the children of men, you will for
 this very reason protect and defend them.³¹

To aid the poor, men should use their common sense, being careful not to abrogate any law which experience seemed to justify, and to remember that difficulties frequently arose in the execution of those laws which were in themselves good. His object (and theirs) was to preserve the rights of Englishmen, so that all might be "cherished in infancy, and permitted to breathe untainted common air; not condemned to be shut up as in the noxious vapours of a dungeon, poisoned with improper aliment, or starved for want."³²

In the *Appeal for Mercy* Hanway praised by name those officers and parishes whose records deserved commendation.³³ In 1765 St. Mary's, Newington set a good example by the fact

³⁰ *The Citizen's Monitor*, 131.

³¹ *Letters on the Rising Generation*, I, ix.

³² *Ibid.*, I, x.

³³ pp. 50-3.

that of the ten children under its supervision only one died; these had evidently had excellent care. Nurse Howe of St. Mary Whitechapel won his highest praise, because in 1762 her parish had had only one dead of five children, in 1764 all of six had lived (the 1763 abstract was blank), and in 1765 only two of eighteen had died. Although Nurse Howe received only 2s. 6d. weekly for each child she was clearly a good nurse.

The rarity of Hanway's praise becomes apparent when placed beside his comments on parish after parish. His own St. Andrew above Bars (where he became a vestryman in 1766) had combined with St. George the Martyr, and the workhouse turned in reports which he thought shameful to any civilized people. In 1766, of twenty-four children from one to three and one-half years (past the dangerous age), seventeen had apparently been nursed in the workhouse and four by outside nurses in London. Ten of the seventeen in the workhouse died after an average stay of thirty-two days. Of the four outside one had died. Of ninety infants less than twelve months of age, seventy-eight had been nursed in the workhouse, nine by nurses in London and six by nurses in the country. Sixty-four had died in the workhouse after an average stay of twenty-four and one-third days, one of the nine in town had died, and two of the six in the country. Eleven were discharged to their mothers.

From this record a child one to three years old might expect to live one month in the workhouse; those of less than one year averaged three weeks, but one babe had existed nine months and eleven days in the house, thus distorting the figure. Of one hundred and three children under observation, seventy-seven had died. "From the whole account it is evident that custom reconciles the most barbarous and savage practices, and that these may pass unnoticed in the most enlightened ages of religion."³⁴

In 1764 St. George Middlesex received fifteen children of the following ages: nine months, eight; eighteen months, one; two years, four; three years, two. During the year ten

³⁴ *Appeal for Mercy*, 61.

died, three were discharged, and Hanway found no one who knew what had become of the other two. He printed a copy of this parish report for the next year and added a column of "Days lived":

Name of child.	Age			When admitted to workhouse.	By whom sent.	When died in workhouse.	Days lived.
	Yrs.	Mo.	D.				
Thomas Bailey ...	2		2	Jan.	Overseers	9 Jan.	7
Mary Bill ...		2	4		Churchwarden	17 Feb.	43
Elizabeth Bill ...	1	11	4		Churchwarden	19 Feb.	45
Lucy Coleman ...		5	24		Overseers	11 Mar.	47
Isaac Darling ...	2	3	5	Feb.	Churchwarden	13 Mar.	38
Ann Bailey ...	2	9	16		Overseers	29 Feb.	13
James Gloves ...	2	4	20		Overseers	14 Mar.	23
John St. George (F)	2		21		Overseers	28 Mar.	35
Susannah Downes	2		4	Mar.	Overseers	15 Mar.	11
William Chope (B)		2	28		Overseers	14 Apr.	17
Mary Webb ...		8			Overseers		
Richard Yates ...		6	21	Nov.	Churchwarden		
William Yates ...	2		21		Churchwarden	14 Dec.	24
Susannah Yates ...		4	21		Churchwarden	21 Dec.	31
Jane Dryborough	3	9	22		Overseers		
Elizabeth Hathaway	2		15	Dec.	Overseers		
Benjamin Tomkins	2	3	19		Overseers		
William Carns ...	3	4	19		Overseers		
Peter Flidgard ...	2		20		Churchwarden		

[signed] Thomas Beal, Churchwarden.³⁵

In this list were one foundling, one bastard, and seventeen legitimate children of the poor. Thirteen children were between the ages of one and four years.

At first glance this workhouse might seem to have had a death rate of only sixty-three per cent, but Hanway called attention to the fact that five of the seven survivors had been admitted since the latter part of November. He therefore completed the record early in 1766:

1. The mother of Mary Webb bore another child and was discharged with both.
2. Elizabeth Hathaway was discharged to her mother.

³⁵ *Appeal for Mercy*, 40-4.

3. Peter Flidgard was discharged.
4. Jane Dryborough—dead.
5. Benjamin Tomkins—dead.
6. William Carns—dead.
7. Richard Yates—dead.

The death rate in the workhouse of St. George Middlesex was one hundred per cent.³⁶

The public might reasonably have expected ninety per cent of these children to live, because most of them were already more than twelve months of age. But, wrote Hanway, the record was not surprising

. . . when it is considered that these children were put into the hands of indigent, filthy, or decrepit women, three or four to one woman, and sometimes sleeping with them. The allowance of these women being scanty, they are tempted to take part of the bread and milk intended for the poor infants. The child cries for food and the nurse beats it because it cries. Thus, with blows, starving, and putrid air, with the additions of lice, itch and filthiness, he soon receives his quietus . . . There are now in this workhouse 100 men and about 20 women; here are 200 poor sometimes crowded together.³⁷

If men expected children to live they must insist upon more healthy surroundings and care.

Even though many rich inhabitants paid rates in St. Giles in the Fields and St. George Bloomsbury, Hanway expressed the opinion that the combined workhouse serving these two parishes was the most deadly in London. He concluded from his figures that children there did not generally live over forty days and that even mothers could only expect to bury their progeny if they remained in the workhouse long. On January 1st, 1766 the statistics for this workhouse showed :

Received, 1762-4, and living in the house	45
Born and received during 1765	133
	— 178

³⁶ *Appeal for Mercy*, 42.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 42-3.

In 1765, dead after one month	53
discharged to mother within one month	54
born or received and living ...	14
received in the last days of Dec- ember	12
<hr/>	
Total Born or received in 1765	133
Of the 45 remaining from 1762-4:	
Dead	8
Discharged	8
At nurse outside	6
Continued in 1766	23
<hr/>	
	178 ³⁸

From the 133 children admitted in 1765 Hanway subtracted the 54 discharged and the 12 recently admitted in order to get a just basis on which to measure the institution's effectiveness. Thus he observed that only 14 of 67 had survived any considerable part of the year. Continuing this analysis, he found that 81 infants had been registered who were less than twelve months of age, of whom 5 were admitted in the last days of the year. Among the 76 remaining, 32 had been discharged to their mothers, 39 had died, and 5 were still at public charge. That is, explained Hanway, eleven per cent had been able to survive more than the few days at the end of the year. He had little hope that any would live to be apprenticed.

Exclusive of the month of December, St. Luke's Middlesex registered thirty-three children in the year 1765.³⁹ Twenty-six were less, and seven were more than one year of age. Of the babies three were discharged, fifteen died and eight continued in the workhouse. Five of the seven who were more than a year old had died. Twenty-six of the thirty-three had been nursed by their mothers, and four of the others had been granted sixpence per week as "nursing money," three living. Hanway thought that all children in this institution died within three years.

³⁸ *Appeal for Mercy*, 50.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 54-5.

Thirty-one children were registered at the workhouse in St. Clement Danes during the year 1765. Six were discharged with their mothers. Among the twenty-five remaining, seventeen died of the nineteen who were less than twelve months of age, and four of the six who were older. Nurse Poole of that parish provided such care that eighteen of her twenty-three children died after about one month. That record startled even Hanway.

Lest the public assume that these instances of brutality were isolated, regrettable but unusual, Hanway presented a table of statistics revealed on January 1st, 1766 by the abstracts of all the workhouses in London :

Registered as under twelve months of age	995
Dead, less than three months of age	241	24%
three to six months of age ...	80	8%
six to nine months of age ...	50	5%
nine to twelve months of age	41	4%
Total dead	412	41%
Discharged ...	256	25 $\frac{3}{4}$ %
Sent to be nursed in the country ...	141	14%
Alive in workhouses ...	186	18 $\frac{3}{4}$ %
Total supposed to be alive ...	583	58 $\frac{1}{2}$ % ⁴⁰

After adding the 186 living in the workhouses to the 412 who had died there, Hanway computed that 31 per cent had survived the calendar year of their birth. From past experience he had little hope that 10 per cent would be alive on January 1st, 1767.

All together 1,795 children were reported to be in London workhouses during 1765, a figure which included 580 still alive from preceding years and 220 admitted after they were a year old. By the abstracts of the parishes the total number could be classed as follows: foundlings, 115; illegitimate, 632; casual, 228; and legitimate, 820. Since some of the

⁴⁰ *Appeal for Mercy*, 22ff.

foundlings and casuals were probably legitimate, half the total had been born to families too poor to support their offspring. Therefore, argued Hanway, these children deserved assistance from the more fortunate.

The honest, kindly burghers who read Hanway's *Appeal for Mercy* must have squirmed under his accusation that all Londoners were accessories to murder. People were conscious of the reputation of their parish. Men and women were just as proud of their "sensibility" as they were of their common sense, both characteristics glorified in the novels of Fielding and Smollett, of Richardson and Sterne. *The Fool of Quality*, later edited by John Wesley for his followers, extolled to its readers a continual, almost quixotic charity and tenderness in the face of suffering, as prerequisites of all gentlemen, particularly of those in trade. The Rev. Mr. Villars, Dr. Primrose, Squire Allworthy, Parson Adams, Matthew Bramble, Sir Launcelot Greaves, My Uncle Toby—almost every novel had its particularly lovable character who was instantly moved to acts of charity by the sight of human suffering. As Hanway published names and details of his researches in his letters to the *Daily Advertiser*, the men attacked must have felt that he was being grossly unfair to single them out. When the evidence on St. Clement Danes appeared, "Philo Pauperis" wrote Hanway a sharp reply, defending that parish.

The officers of St. Clement Danes, wrote "Philo Pauperis," had always been men of candour and humanity who would be just as scornful of abuse as Mr. Hanway.⁴¹ They were helpless, however, before the inhuman mothers who abandoned their children along the streets. Because of the penalties for this crime, the mother who abandoned her babe first hid it so well that it was likely to be perishing when found. In 1765 one infant had been so well hidden during the night that it had not been discovered until the following noon, when rescuers were guided by its cries. Another had been found at eleven o'clock at night and sent to the workhouse, but it was so overgrown and scabbed from head to foot with venereal disease that it could not possibly have lived more

⁴¹ Printed in *Letters on the Rising Generation*, I, 1-3.

than the few days that it did. Nor could the officers punish guilty mothers, for when one had actually been traced and taken to court the magistrate freed her on a mere promise not to repeat the offence. More children would live and the populace would be more orderly and industrious if the city increased the number of its workhouses and enforced the laws. While "Philo Pauperis" admitted that good citizens should rectify the things amiss in St. Clement Danes, Hanway's criticism had been most unjust to men who deserved public respect.

In answering the letter of "Philo Pauperis" Hanway granted at once that the inhabitants of a parish would scorn to be wilfully guilty of slaughtering children; his point was that men had not exercised ingenuity and industry to preserve them. Had the eighteen children been sent to the Foundling, six of them would have been alive after ten years instead of all eighteen being dead after one month. The whole issue, as he saw it, was the method by which human lives could be saved. True, St. Clement's paid 2s. a week to a parish nurse, while some officers paid nothing; but could one nurse care for a dozen infants at one time? Were the officers unaware that babies together endangered one another? Did they not know that their charges contracted disease and disorders from the air they breathed and the food they ate? Here the officers had failed in their duty to the parish.

"Philo Pauperis" had said proudly that his parish had always obeyed the laws, and Hanway had no doubt that this was true. But what difference did their abiding by the laws make if the children died? ⁴²

But permit me to ask, would not any man in his senses conclude, after the death of three or four children in one woman's hands, that the nurse was very unfortunate; and after five or six, that she was very ignorant or very wicked? But when in so short a period, the mortality of seven or eight had happened, would it not create a suspicion that she starved them or gave them sleeping potions? And would not the same common sense and candour lead

⁴² *Letters on the Rising Generation*, I, 10-11.

one to think that, upon seeing the eighteenth child brought within this parish nurse's den, those who sent them preferred that they should die? ⁴³

Then it was that Hanway related his findings of the part which St. Clement Danes had taken in the 1686 experiment at Middlesex. What proof had "Philo Pauperis" that the officers of his parish merited the respect of the public?

In 1767 Hanway was urging Parliament to enact further legislation to protect the poor children of London. Rearing children in workhouses seemed to him so hopeless that he wanted the government to require the parishes to send their infants to the Foundling Hospital, each district paying for the support of its own.⁴⁴ Handicapped as it had been, the hospital had demonstrated that it was five hundred per cent the more efficient, and it was actually equipped to support a thousand children each year, this being the number London parishes ordinarily received. Hanway harped on this proposal for the rest of his life, but Parliament would consider no more measures to expand the Foundling.

Hanway did succeed, however, in getting a compromise Act passed (7 George III, c. 39), which effectively changed conditions in the workhouse. This Act provided that no child under six years of age should remain in the workhouse over three weeks, that each infant at public charge must be sent at least three miles into the country, and that the registers be enlarged to account for each child until it was apprenticed. People had come to agree with Hanway that children were unlikely to survive in the workhouse and that country life was more healthy than that in the city. Men also saw the value of detailed registers, and Hanway hoped that the plain facts revealed might induce overseers to allow mothers one or two shillings a week to nurse their infants at home and to force an inspection of nurses and children for venereal disease, lest either be infected by the other. These hopes were justified and Hanway came to suggest, hesitatingly, that depraved parents living in squalor should have their progeny taken

⁴³ *Letters on the Rising Generation*, I, 6-7.

⁴⁴ *Appeal for Mercy*, 25.

from them by the parish. Hanway believed that the Act of 1767 saved the lives of fifteen hundred children annually.⁴⁵ Sir Frederic M. Eden agreed that no doubt it had preserved the lives of many thousand children.⁴⁶

Another provision in this same Act was of almost equal importance, so far as it removed one of the evils of child labour and the apprentice system, by decreasing the friction between youths and masters. After 1767 youths were bound only to the age of twenty-one rather than twenty-four, in order that every adult might be free and independent. Grown men could now assume the privileges and responsibilities of their age; they could marry, beget children, and keep what they earned. In fact, one of the strongest arguments in support of this measure, as it was publicly debated, was that the freed man would do just these things and help meet the English demand for labour.

Since the statistics quoted on preceding pages seem to reveal that the indigent families of London had small likelihood of bringing their children to maturity, what was the probability that any city child would survive? The best available figures are those of Edmonds,⁴⁷ a statistician, who in 1836 made a study of the common bills of mortality. In reading this (rearranged) table one must remember that there was no requirement to register either all the births or all the deaths.

BIRTHS								
	1730-49	%	1750-69	%	1770-89	%	1790-1810	%
Total	315,456		307,395		349,477		386,393	
Between Ages								
DEATHS								
0-2 yrs.	190,200	60.2	153,886	50.6	140,810	40.3	117,070	30.3
2-5 yrs.	44,887	14.3	39,808	12.4	39,248	11.2	42,501	11.0
Total	235,087	74.5%	193,694	63%	180,058	51.5%	159,571	41.3% ⁴⁸

Assuming that Edmond's figures are reliable, Hanway seems

⁴⁵ *Abstract for County Naval Free Schools*, xxxvi.

⁴⁶ *The State of the Poor*, ed. A. G. L. Rogers, 62.

⁴⁷ Quoted by Caulfield, *Infant Welfare Movement in the Eighteenth Century*, 179.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

to have been optimistic in 1766 when he estimated that only 45 per cent of London children died before they were five years of age. Since the death rate elsewhere in England ranged from 6 per cent to 25 per cent, Fielding must have been thinking of good London citizens rather than those of the country when Parson Adams stated that he was now the father of six and had been of eleven. The death of children was as common as it was tragic.

Thus far, this chapter has been concerned only with Hanway's efforts to save the lives of unfortunate children. At the same time he was working to rehabilitate and to assist the older persons who had been forced to seek shelter at public charge. These had come to the workhouse from various causes and frequently had little in common other than that they were unable to earn an honest livelihood. The lame, the halt and the blind, the petty thief, sturdy beggar and promiscuous woman, the "moping idiot and the madman gay"—all came to the workhouse. Here also came the faithful housekeepers and servants too aged or infirm to continue at their posts, and those who set up the institutions had usually expressed a desire to have these maintained apart from the filthy, diseased and vicious. The structures became too crowded for this division, however, and when labouring inmates ruined some materials or offered finished products of poor workmanship, the parish herded them all together, gave them subsistence and tried to forget their existence. Men who investigated reported that paupers lived in idleness, smoked in bed despite all rules to the contrary, and begged pennies with which to buy gin. To prevent this complete demoralization Hanway demanded that the overseers inspect all activities more closely and impose an iron discipline.

First, he proposed that each parish acquire a building adequate to its needs. Then the officers should prevent the magistrate from crowding it with petty malefactors. Under the present system Hanway showed, by reference to his own parish, reform was not possible. St. Andrew above Bars had combined with St. George the Martyr to build a workhouse which was barely large enough for

. . . 180 persons, servants included. We once, after an elaborate debate, most righteously resolved not to admit into it above 280. There are at this time above 360 and, if the magistrate sends 360 more, according to the reasoning which is adopted, they must all be received! ⁴⁹

Although everyone knew that both the house and its inmates ought to be kept scrupulously clean, in the places he had visited :

. . . with respect to air, few persons accustomed to cleanly life can bear the stench of them, or stand the survey of such misery . . . The atmosphere of uncleansed garments and diseased bodies crowded in numbers beyond what is . . . proper in life; the consequences must be maladies innumerable . . . One rarely finds those who had been bred up in workhouses become robust, or of any considerable stature . . . ⁵⁰

Besides recommending Matthew Hale's ventilators Hanway assured overseers that a hot iron placed in vinegar fumigated buildings effectively.⁵¹ Too many paupers developed Humphry Clinker's physique, and too few his character. Humphry, reared in a country workhouse,

. . . seemed to be about twenty years of age, of a middling size, with bandy legs, stooping shoulders, high forehead, sandy locks, pinking eyes, flat nose and long chin; but his complexion was of a sickly yellow. His looks denoted famine; and the rags that he wore could hardly conceal what decency requires to be covered.⁵²

In providing subsistence for those at parish charge, the duty of the officer was to assure to each person the "common blessings of heaven," such as water and air, but he had an obligation to the ratepayers to spend only such parish funds as he must. The bad health in workhouses, Hanway argued, was due to the paupers being "too high fed, or too little

⁴⁹ *The Citizen's Monitor*, 126-7.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.* In his "Introduction" to Sir F. M. Eden's *State of the Poor*, xlii-xliii, Rogers confirms this. See also Marshall, *English Poor in Eighteenth Century*, 142-3.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 131.

⁵² *Humphry Clinker*, Letter to Sir Watkins Phillips, London, May 24th.

exercised, or from bad air.”⁵³ Since those admitted were accustomed to a meagre diet, workhouse plenty frequently produced surfeit. The discipline of restraining appetites would educate the indigent man and woman against being “inflamed into many other excesses,” and a reduced expense for food make it more nearly possible for them to earn their keep.⁵⁴ Like Johnson and Smollett Hanway thought that threepence-halfpenny to fourpence-halfpenny would buy sufficient food for a man’s daily needs and that paupers should live on a sixth or seventh part less. Since many poor persons kept free of the workhouse on an expenditure of threepence a day,⁵⁵ anyone who knitted a pair of stockings worth a shilling in four days ought to be practically self-supporting. Therefore, to reduce the Poor’s Rate, Hanway suggested that overseers put those inmates able to work on an allowance of twopence a day in order to make them more industrious. One penny of this sufficed for warm soup at dinner, and if a pauper would not work, this would keep him as filled as he deserved to be. Hanway stated firmly that those who disdained what was provided “must be considered as ignorant, prejudiced and unworthy of charity; or profligate and an object of the rod of the magistrate.”⁵⁶

Hanway argued that parishes had mistakenly treated men and women in workhouses with tenderness and consideration. The buildings had been provided to furnish a means of self-support to those who were able and willing to work; yet people not only allowed paupers to evade their duties but also allowed them to remove those badges, required by law, which revealed that they were supported by the Poor’s Rate of the parish whose emblem they wore. Inmates of workhouses had no “right” to support and should be forced to earn the greatest possible proportion of their own livelihood:

They can do this, and they would do it if they were early taught. There are many perverse beings in human shape who will be slothful, but there are also rods which were

⁵³ Hanway, *Letters to the Guardians of the Infant Poor* (1767), 23–7.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ *The Citizen’s Monitor*, viii.

made for the backs of fools : there is solitude, darkness, a scanty provision of bread and water and, above all, reason and discourse to soften their hearts and open their eyes to a sense of the misery which they bring on themselves and which they attempt to bring on other people also.⁵⁷

Because every parish suffered from the impositions of a few shiftless people, overseers eyed poor newcomers sceptically and tried to drive even the industrious and innocent elsewhere for fear these might possibly some time add to the numbers of parish poor supported by the rates. Parishes spent £35,000 annually in litigations over settlements. If overseers were properly severe in their discipline parishes could either save this money or devote it to the benefit of the infant and infirm. Regardless of this, anyone who could earn part or all of his own support should be made to do so.

If a parish had no workhouse it usually contracted with a mill owner or manufacturer to care for its poor. Since he received from fourpence to sixpence a day for each person, plus the labour of his charges, Hanway thought that both the contractor and the poor might benefit from the arrangement. The parish escaped the aggravation of a workhouse and maintained its poor just as cheaply.

As Hanway saw it, the function of the workhouse in its care of adults was to supply such necessities of life as the individual himself could not earn. While the parish had a duty to supply necessities, in self-protection it must see that the indigent laboured diligently in their own behalf and that parish funds were not wasted. When he visited the workhouses he saw that the poor could be supported on half the sums expended by the overseers and that paupers died like flies in the midst of idleness, filth and disease. The institutions must, therefore, be rendered healthy and the administration undergo changes to make it efficient and its charges industrious. The effectiveness of his crusade is shown by comparing the mortality rate on the total number received from 1762 to 1766 and that on the number admitted from 1767 to 1773. In the first period 60 $\frac{4}{5}$ per cent of the inmates died ;

⁵⁷ *Abstract for County Naval Free Schools*, xxxij.

in the second $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. In the first period $74\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of those admitted under two years of age died; in the second 32 per cent.⁵⁸ These figures tell their own story.

So long as the workhouse continued to serve as a catchall for the infant, aged and infirm on the one hand and for the able-bodied incompetents and petty criminals on the other, efficient management was impossible. Hanway knew this and constantly urged more careful consideration of the problems of the individual. His revelation of conditions in the institutions he had visited helped to inform the public and bring people to support the Act Thomas Gilbert lobbied through Parliament in 1782. Gilbert's Act (22 George III c. 83) allowed parishes to combine their workhouses so that those persons who were quite unable to work could be maintained apart, while the others were turned over to a contractor who would keep them employed. By the Act certain elected gentlemen were to be responsible for the welfare of those in the institution and the powers of the overseer were curtailed. This measure undoubtedly improved the lot of the helpless. It also separated the able-bodied so that they could be sent in groups to the mills of the Midlands. There an employer would see that they earned their keep.

With this modification the unwieldy, inefficient system lumbered on into the nineteenth century. The public no longer believed that poverty merited scorn; a sympathetic attitude developed, for men like Sir Frederic Morton Eden showed that labourers could hardly purchase the necessities of life from the wages they were paid. Yet, although pamphlets and pious tales were distributed by the millions and familiarized the reading public with the problems of the poor, the workhouse made little mark on the more polite literature. In 1837, when *Oliver Twist* brought his porridge bowl up for a second helping, Dickens touched the heart-strings of a public who were prepared to like such incidents. Had this book appeared in 1737, those who could read would have been puzzled, for their sympathies would have been with the overseer.

⁵⁸ Hanway, *The Defects of Police the Cause of Immorality, and the Continual Robberies Committed* (1775), vi-vii.

No one could question the wisdom of making it possible for these infants to survive and become the citizens of another generation. Meantime, however, there was almost equal misery among the poor who had never been admitted to a public institution. Hanway turned his attention to those lads who must sleep in the streets and fight for such bread as they ate.

CHAPTER IV

THE MARINE SOCIETY

DURING the three hundred and fifty years that the English navy has dominated the seas progressive men have devoted their lives to the institution of reforms which would make the service more effective. The Elizabethans, Hawkins and Drake, devised fast-sailing, manageable ships which destroyed the blundering galleons of Philip; Pepys worked wonders in administration to enable the Stuarts to meet the Dutch and the French. In 1756 a group of patriotic and charitable business men founded the Marine Society for the immediate purpose of assisting the Government to recruit a war-time force and, eventually, both to improve the personnel and to give worthy, indigent lads a chance to earn an honest livelihood at sea.

The loyal gentlemen of the Marine Society sought to restore the efficiency which Pepys had established in the preceding century. That this had declined was due in part to the increased speed with which other nations put to sea on a declaration of war, and in part to a decline in morale among sailors, who felt that they received better treatment and pay in merchant vessels. By removing just causes of complaint and recruiting energetically the gentlemen believed that they could rejuvenate the navy, establish a permanent force for defence in war and increase trade in time of peace.

Merchants and ship captains wanted the government to find a way to man the navy without disrupting private industry. In years of peace most warships were laid up, for then a few vessels and about ten thousand men performed the routine duties. On the outbreak of war fifty thousand sailors had to be recruited as rapidly as possible; that is, all English seamen were needed in the navy alone. Not only were complete crews of merchant vessels drafted, but press gangs were sent into the city to seize men wherever they could be found.

The literature of the age reveals the fact that crimps and landladies sometimes allowed personal prejudice to dictate when they assisted the officers in rounding up a sufficient number of recruits by "spotting" those who seemed to have no regular employment. When the gangs were out it was dangerous to appear in the streets, for any wayfarer might be shanghaied like Roderick Random. Threadbare and weak from his recent illness, Roderick was hit over the head and manacled in a cutter for twenty-four hours. Half dead from loss of blood when he was finally taken aboard ship, he there found an overpowering stench, inedible food and a sick bay so crowded that the surgeons had to hold back the hammock of one patient while attending another.

Men entering the navy, whether their service was voluntary or induced by the press gang, went to sea in the clothes they happened to be wearing. Outfits were not issued until they could be paid for, and prize money and wages were generally six months in arrears. Since the common people of that age bought clothes infrequently and then, for warmth, put the new garments on over the old rags, recruits were painfully unprepared for duty in northern latitudes. Bathing was unusual. Trained seamen therefore shunned novices on two counts, and officers found their force split by faction, which delayed the necessary instruction.

In the war with France in the 'forties a navy Captain (Thomas Hanway?) discovered that he could train a crew more rapidly if all were dressed in new, uniform clothing. To unify his force he had then advanced each of his men thirty shillings from the next prize money and had ordered tailors to make new suits. The repugnance of the old sailors to the landsmen ceased almost immediately, and he was ready for war in one-third the usual time. He believed that other officers could profit from this example.

In 1753 Charles Dingley, Hanway's former partner in Russia, interested Hanway in a plan to form an organization which would apprentice poor boys in the navy and aboard merchantmen. Hundreds of lads, half-naked and half-starved, slept in deserted buildings and learned to prey upon

London for their bread. At sea they might rehabilitate themselves and serve their country. Dingley also approached the guardians of several charity schools and workhouses for assistance, but not until 1756 was he able to enlist the support of enough citizens to found the Marine Society.

Meanwhile England and France had declared war, and seamen were needed both for the navy and for the merchant service. The Governors of the Marine Society therefore did not at once consider apprenticing the lads because they believed that supplying clothes to men entering the navy would be of more immediate use. Not only would this make the recruits more efficient, but it would also encourage other men to enlist.

Prior to this, John (later Sir John) Fielding had succeeded his brother Henry as magistrate at Bow Street and continued Henry's efforts to maintain order in that district. About the time that a group with Hanway were planning the Marine Society, John Fielding was racking his brains for some means of ridding the streets of those lads who were being bred up as thieves and who must in time appear before him for sentence. When a Captain in the navy wrote asking him to procure a youth to act as servant aboard ship, Fielding thought that sending these potential trouble-makers to sea might solve his problem, for a navy of 40,000 men required 3,000 boys between the ages of thirteen and eighteen. Although some of these performed tasks beyond the power of street waifs, the majority performed only the most menial duties. In order to get his lads from around Bow Street accepted, Fielding bought them new clothing and paid their expenses to the dock. By June 1756 he had exhausted his funds and came to the new Marine Society for assistance. Since sending lads to sea would help to defeat the French the group then voted to clothe both men and boys.

The gentlemen had organized their society simply. The founding Governors elected Lord Romney chairman, to be assisted at the weekly meetings by eight deputy chairmen chosen from among themselves. The treasurer was John Thornton, a director in the Russia Company and son of a

director in the Bank of England. A navy surgeon was to examine the men who appeared for clothing and to send those needing medical care aboard a hospital ship at the King's charge. Dr. James offered to contribute his services in treating the boys whose minor ailments stood in the way of their being accepted, and Mr. Hasky, an apothecary, furnished medicines to the society at a special rate. Once each week the Governors met to review their work and to plan for the future. From June 25th, 1756, when his name first appeared in the minutes, until his death Hanway was of all the Governors the most regular in attendance.

By the middle of July 1756 the society was ready to publish in the newspapers a notice that they would clothe recruits who brought a certificate of enlistment to the Merchant Seaman's Office on Thursday between eleven and one o'clock. On August 12th of that year Hanway brought a short account of the plan and purposes of the group to the weekly meeting, and the Governors voted that this be sent to the newspapers in order to acquaint patriotic and philanthropic Londoners of the progress of the charity and to solicit contributions.¹ To create confidence they pointed out to the public that they were doing only that which was beneficial to everyone and obviously necessary to the government. The efforts of press gangs would not usually be directed toward men or boys who were well-dressed, industrious citizens, and few of these were likely to volunteer. Regardless of their willingness, the threadbare recruits must be clothed before it would be possible for them to be effective seamen. The traditional method of impressment had little to recommend it: the average cost was £10 per man, the navy was delayed in formation and in training, city life was disordered, and no one could tell whether the individuals thus enlisted would prove useful. Comparing the men pressed with those they themselves enlisted, the society granted that their selections were "worth" only £5, but even so their organization saved the Government money and chose recruits whose departure would improve the tone of life for those remaining in England. The

¹ *Minute Books, passim.*

immediate advantage, of course, was that men and boys were supplied at a time when they were needed.

When, on January 13th, 1757, the King announced a bounty of thirty shillings and two months' advance pay to anyone enlisting, the society agreed to supply clothing only to the value of thirty-five shillings. While the Governors wanted to furnish the men with necessities, they had no desire to contribute these if the men could buy them; nor did they wish to allow seamen to spend their funds in riot and debauchery.

The business of the society required close supervision because a constant stream of men and boys, the Colonel Jacks and the Jonathan Wilds, appeared eager to defraud the Governors in any possible way. Too frequently the ne'er-do-wells whom the gentlemen had clothed ran away at the first opportunity. Because the society had been put to considerable expense in clothing them, Admiral Boscawen ordered that it be notified of these defections as they occurred. In July 1758, after several had escaped, the Governors decided to send all clothing aboard vessels at Longreach, the permanent secretary or clerk attending in order to make sure that the slop-seller actually supplied the materials agreed upon.

To make sure that the brown (blue after 1759) cloth used was the best obtainable, the society bought it direct from a Yorkshire manufacturer after having it examined for indications of bad weaving or stretching. As a result, the pea-jackets lasted twice as long as those in common use and resisted the weather four times as well.² A full outfit of clothing consisted of the following articles:

MEN	BOYS
1 felt seaman's hat.	1 felt hat.
1 kersey pea-jacket.	2 worsted caps.
1 kersey waistcoat with a slashed sleeve.	1 kersey pea-jacket.
1 kersey drawers.	1 kersey pair of breeches.
1 pair drab breeches.	1 striped flannel or kersey waistcoat.

² Hanway, *Letter from a Member of the Marine Society, Shewing the Piety, Generosity and Utility of their Design with Respect to the Sea Service* (1757), 49; hereafter referred to as *Letter from a Member of the Marine Society*.

MEN

1 pair worsted hose.
 1 pair yarn hose.
 2 shirts.
 2 worsted caps.
 1 pair of shoes.
 1 pair of buckles.
 1 pair of buttons.
 1 knife.
 1 pair of thin trousers.
 1 *Seaman's Monitor*.³
 1 bag to put clothes in.
 Thread, worsted and needles.

Boys

1 pair of trousers.
 2 pair of hose.
 2 pair of shoes.
 2 handkerchiefs.
 3 shirts.
 1 bed, pillow, blanket and
 coverlet.
 1 pair of buckles.
 1 pair of buttons.
 1 knife.
 1 *Seaman's Monitor*.³
 1 *Christian Knowledge Made
 Easy*.³
 1 bag to put clothes in.
 Thread, worsted and needles.⁴

In writing the *Letter from a Member of the Marine Society* (1757), as well as the *Abstract* (1757) thereof for those who wished less detail, Hanway easily proved that clothing the recruits was both patriotic and useful, for he had only to remind men of facts which they themselves must have observed. He believed that every loyal subject should seek to overcome the prejudice against enlisting in the navy. Seamen had no objection to working aboard merchantmen, but many strove to evade service on warships because they preferred as little discipline and as high wages as possible. Hanway thought, moreover, that Englishmen encouraged riot and debauchery when they assumed that drinking and other vices were characteristic of all sailors because "seamen should be of that temper," and that the "intrepid spirit" of crews arose from "a total inaptitude to think of God or devil."

To destroy these prejudices Hanway not only appealed to patriotism but also showed by hard-headed figures the advantages of naval service. The labourer who went down to sea was not necessarily an ungovernable scapegrace, as men were prone to believe; in point of fact he was more ambitious than his fellows. In the navy an able seaman earned £13 10s. each year besides his prize money, while a plowman toiled

³ Hanway seems to have rewritten these books of advice for this special purpose.

⁴ *Letter from a Member of the Marine Society*, 53.

"excessive hard" to earn £3 or £4. To suppose that a man had not followed an advantageous trade because it was "profitable, or because he may have acquired some property, is contrary to the common principles by which human life is governed."⁵ And service in the navy must be more profitable than that in merchantmen inasmuch as the King surely paid wages equal to those of private business and the men received a share in the proceeds from the sale of vessels they captured.⁶ The danger could be no greater for, like Johnson, Hanway observed that in the tea trade half the crew might die during a voyage to China. Regardless of such logic, sailors continued to prefer serving in merchantmen.

Hanway's books and the work of the Marine Society must have done much to improve the attitude toward seamen and to make the trade less fearsome. Many eighteenth century Britons still had an ancient Roman's dislike of the sea, and with some reason, for the average life of a sailor was then computed at seven years. Samuel Johnson facetiously said that it was better to be a prisoner in jail than to be employed on board a ship, because the prisoner died in comparative ease and freedom from fear. If men were warmly clothed before leaving shore, the society believed that they might live longer, become more able, and that others would be enlisted more easily. The charity had an obvious value to the men and to the nation. Admiral Boscawen wrote later that "no scheme for manning the navy within my knowledge has ever had the success of the Marine Society's."⁷

The society provided much the same advantages for the boys who were sent as servants to the commissioned and warrant officers. Theoretically these lads were apprentices learning a trade, and the Government offered them no bounty or practical inducement to go to sea. In trades an apprentice

⁵ Hanway, *Three Letters on the Subject of the Marine Society* (1758), Let. IV, 9; hereafter referred to as *Three Letters on the Marine Society*.

⁶ James Oglethorpe, *Sailor's Advocate* (1728), 16-17, and Leslie F. Church, *Oglethorpe: A Study of Philanthropy in England and Georgia* (1932), 29. Oglethorpe complained that while men earned 22s. 6d. a month, they were fortunate actually to receive 10s. The merchant service paid regularly 30s. to 40s. each month.

⁷ *Letter from a Member of the Marine Society*, 41.

was customarily bound for seven years or to the age of twenty-four (the age set centuries earlier), but in time of war a boy of eighteen could be rated as an able seaman if the officer chose to advance him. (Trade masters sometimes enlisted their apprentices in order to collect their wages.⁸) A servant accustomed to the sea might be a better sailor than a pressed landsman or a volunteer, but his officer was not eager to give him this rating until a successor to do the drudgery had been provided. According to regulations servants received an annual wage of £11 9s. 6d., but because they were "apprentices" the officers allowed them 40s. in clothes and collected the wages for themselves.⁹ At best a boy might requisition a year's clothing immediately; at worst he might continue for years with neither wages nor clothes allowance.¹⁰ The Marine Society furnished warm clothes and a means of livelihood to boys who had neither, and a steady supply of servants to officers. They benefited London citizens by removing waifs from temptation before their needs should force them into crime.

To supply clothing to thousands of applicants the society required money, and in time of war patriotic citizens contributed generously. Revising his *Letter from a Member of the Marine Society* from time to time in order to keep the public interested and abreast of the progress made, Hanway sold or gave away seven editions in a little over two years. He discussed the society's plans, problems and achievements in dozens of books and pamphlets written primarily to benefit other charities, and offered ingenious plans to co-ordinate this philanthropy with others, suggesting, for example, that foundlings and youths in workhouses be apprenticed by the society

⁸ Hanway, *Appeal for Mercy*, 107.

⁹ Hanway, "Advertisement" to *Christian Knowledge Made Easy* (n.d.), 4.

¹⁰ On June 19th, 1783 the Society received a request from Richard Stafford for clothes in which he could travel from his ship to his home in Scotland. He had received only prize money and gifts from an aunt since 1779, and now that he was to be discharged, he was too naked to be seen. The shocked Governors sent him clothes and two guineas for expenses. His master, Captain Cornwallis, stated that he had made the usual allowance for clothes and had assumed that the proper officer had furnished them. (*Minute Books*.)

because these could do most as sailors to defend the national safety and to increase British trade.

Between June 1756 and December 1757 clothing had been given to 3,097 men and to 2,046 boys. By March 1758 the Society had collected £13,546 7s. and spent £12,811 10s. 10d. They raised money in many ways. The Company of Weavers gave £50, the Cooks £52 10s. and the Goldsmiths £200. George II contributed £1,000 when Hanway presented him with a copy of his *Abstract of the Letter from a Member of the Marine Society*. "Two gentlemen, in acknowledgment of injustice done a lady," paid five guineas into the treasury; and Messrs. Cust, Mendez and Roebuck, having recovered for an "unjust insurance," gave £42. Theatre managers gave benefit performances at Sadlers Wells, at Ranelagh House and at Bath. Rich gave a benefit of *The Miser*; Garrick and Lacy, *The Suspicious Husband*; and Signora Mingotti, the opera *Rosmira*.¹¹ The greatest source of income, however, was the contributions of merchants and business men who found the society a philanthropic enterprise worthy of their support. By August 1760 subscriptions totalled over £21,000, and 5,400 men and 4,000 boys had been clothed.

Although they were, of course, eager to collect funds for their work, the gentlemen of the Marine Society were even more desirous of maintaining the goodwill of the public. They refused offers of assistance when the money was to be raised by questionable methods and were likewise zealous in preventing impositions by the unscrupulous. During the first year Theophilus Cibber offered them a benefit, but John Fielding objected that the performances were illegal, and the society refused.¹² An auctioneer blandly announced a sale for their benefit, and Justice Fielding went to demand upon whose authority the man had acted. In 1782 Anthony Parkes of Cornhill presented them with twenty-four lottery tickets, whereupon Thornton published the fact that these had been returned. That men sought to capitalize on its good name indicated the esteem with which the society was generally regarded and the ease with which funds were raised.

¹¹ *Minute Books*, *passim*.

¹² *Ibid.*

Since the London Marine Society had succeeded, the gentlemen proposed to start others. On June 2nd, 1757 Hanway reported to the assembled Governors that he had secured the approval of Lord Winchelsea for one at Dublin. He also read Richard Farr's refusal to establish one at Bristol and a reply thereto, the latter being heartily approved by the members. After this meeting Hanway went to Exeter to establish a society there, and to Bath and Bristol in order to solicit subscriptions for the one at London. He returned to the city during the last week in October and heard that despite promises made to him the Society at Exeter was not to be formed. Although citizens of Edinburgh established no society agents collected boys there during the war and sent them to London for outfits.¹³

The zeal of the Governors apparently aroused doubts in the minds and hearts of their own countrymen. To put this objection bluntly, some men hesitated to support an organization devoted to collecting men and boys for a service in which numbers would surely be killed. To Hanway this argument was quibbling. When war was declared certain numbers of the population had to be enlisted in the armed forces, and some of these were inevitably killed by the enemy. Those sent by the society only helped to form the required force, for all that were sent were needed. In seeking to obviate the necessity for press gangs and "inveigling" the gentlemen were seeking to relieve the nation of one of the horrors of war. Everyone knew that the gangs could not make a distinction between workmen who were valuable to industry (who paid £6,000,000 in taxes) and those who were sturdy beggars, unemployed, or readily spared from their present occupations. The Marine Society could duly consider the character of applicants¹⁴ and decrease the number of angry complaints from employers.¹⁵

Besides pointing out the advantages of the society Hanway had no hesitancy in suggesting ways of making life aboard

¹³ *Minute Books*, *passim*.

¹⁴ Hanway, *Three Letters on the Marine Society*, Let. II, 5.

¹⁵ *The Gentleman's Magazine*, Vol. XXXII, 34-5 (January 1762).

ships more healthy and pleasant. As an incentive to perfection, the officers might divide seamen into classes. The need for certain reforms was obvious even to a landsman like himself. For one thing he thought that an officer should inspect his men at least once a week to insure cleanliness. That foreigners were dirtier than Englishmen might explain why they were more sickly. To prevent disease the officers ought to insist that the air aboard ship be cleaned either by hanging coarse, vinegar-soaked cloths from the beams or else by the ventilators which Matthew Hale had invented years before. (When these contrivances were installed, the Admiralty had to force their use by ordering that they be turned one-half hour in each watch and that the exact times be recorded.¹⁶) Following the example of the Marine Society the Admiralty should prohibit the use of rum and gin and improve the quality of seamen's clothes. If cruises were shortened and safeguards instituted, Hanway thought that "epidemical distempers" would cease and "nothing but lead or iron will make any impression on our brave seamen."¹⁷ Furthermore, Hanway wanted no "undue influence" to screen those "wicked wretches" who furnished "bad provisions to the seamen when a price is allowed for good." In the Supply Office Hanway himself was scrupulously honest, but other men had not been so nice; one contractor had not only collected money for a consignment of rum which he never delivered, but he had also sold the navy's barrels. Smollett published much the same evils in regard to the navy in his *Roderick Random* (1748), and in *Amelia* (1751) Fielding portrayed Captain Booth as being retired from the army because he lacked influence, and as being cheated of his last fifty pounds by a political hanger-on. Defects and abuses in the services were common knowledge.

Before Hanway engaged in any charitable enterprise he assured himself that intense effort was to be devoted to the spiritual as well as to the physical improvement of the unfortunates to be aided. From the first organization of the Marine

¹⁶ *Letter from a Member of the Marine Society*, 41.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

Society, therefore, he not only took active part in the routine business and in advertising the plans, problems and achievements to the general public, but he also worked zealously for the moral regeneration of their protégés. Each was given a copy of the *Seaman's Monitor* as part of his kit; the boys also received *Christian Knowledge Made Easy*, a book of simple exposition by the Archbishop of Tuam which Hanway revised and edited. He wrote, and the society published for distribution, several volumes of "religious and moral instructions" designed to impress men and boys of varying types and age. Besides advice these contained a number of prayers which he had written to meet each group's particular needs, thus instilling the right attitudes toward God and their fellow-men. Among the more popular of these books were *The Soldier's Faithful Friend* (1760), *The Christian Officer* (1760), and *The Sea Lad's Trusty Companion* (1784?). After 1758 the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge provided a testament for each boy. Although no one could determine how well this work succeeded, Hanway continued to urge each individual to search his conscience for evidence of wrongdoing or thinking, to devote part of each day to prayer and meditation, and to attend services regularly. The humble should avoid perplexing controversies by seeking resignation against the hardships God had imposed on people in their station of life. Their trust in God and the goodwill of their superiors would be repaid. For the men and boys of the sea, he observed in 1785 that the Marine Society had been "at the expense of at least twenty thousand moral and religious tracts, some of greater and some of less cost."¹⁸ In doing his duty as a Christian he was also benefiting the nation, for religious sailors would support their wives and children and apprentice their sons to the sea.¹⁹

When Hanway joined the work of the society he saw at once that a reserve force, created from the waste life of London, would save the merchant service from demoralization

¹⁸ Hanway, *Observations on a Proposal Made by Edward King, Esq. to the Marine Society* (1785), 3.

¹⁹ *Three Letters on the Marine Society*, Let. IV, 9-10.

by naval recruiting. For many years to come the nation was likely to be intermittently at war. The navy trained a new force at each outbreak; for example, in 1748 the Government discharged 60,000 men, of whom not one in forty was available for duty less than five years later.²⁰ In time of peace thirty to forty thousand sailors were employed in merchantmen and ten thousand in the navy, a total insufficient for a war-time navy. Through lack of trained seamen, therefore, either war was obstructed, or merchant vessels laid up, or both. One result, Hanway pointed out, was that England lost her trade during periods of conflict, regardless of the outcome of battles. In 1749, 240 more foreign ships entered English ports than in 1743, and Hanway believed that the English tonnage employed eighteen months before the war in the 'forties had been one-fifth greater than that employed eighteen months before the one in the 'fifties, notwithstanding the fact that English efforts to ruin French trade might have been expected to improve their own.²¹

While the English were pressing and training a navy the French were at sea, for they trained their forces in time of peace by requiring all boats to employ extra men. Exclusive of the captain and mate, a French ship of 150 to 200 tons was navigated by twenty to twenty-five men, an English vessel by ten to fourteen. Even in time of peace English boats were undermanned, and because many were lost insurance rates were unnecessarily high. In peace or war too few men sailed the seas.²²

Hanway proposed that in time of peace the five or six thousand ships in the merchant service be classed by size into three groups. For the first group the number of seamen employed should then be increased by one man or boy, for the second group by two, and for the third group by three. This simple measure would increase the number of trained

²⁰ Hanway, *Reasons for an Augmentation of at least Twelve Thousand Mariners, to be Employed in the Merchants-Service, and Coasting-Trade; with Some Thoughts on the Means of Providing for a Number of our Seamen, after the Present War is Finished* (1759), 70; hereafter referred to as *Reasons for 12,000 Mariners*.

²¹ *Reasons for 12,000 Mariners*, 20.

²² *Three Letters on the Marine Society*, Let. IV, 11-12.

sailors by ten or twelve thousand men and boys. He suggested also that merchantmen might be required to take a landman on one voyage each year, paying him the wages of a seaman and the Crown paying a bounty of fifty shillings at the expiration of his time. The numbers of trained seamen could again be increased if men-of-war made a practice of discharging two or three thousand annually and substituting untrained recruits in their place. By these measures the two services would aid one another, and the nation maintain a protective force without arousing the fears of other people.²³

Because ship owners were likely to object to the added expense of employing more men, the Government might grant a small increase in the rates on vessels engaged in the coastwise trade and a bounty to those ships which had to meet foreign competition. Of course, a bounty on seamen would be an indirect bounty on goods shipped to foreign ports and a reward to which Englishmen might object, but trade would be encouraged if merchants shipped more safely and paid less for their insurance. Hanway estimated that while this plan would cost the Government £53,332 the country might save £20,000,000 over a period of twenty years through being prepared for the outbreak of war.²⁴ To relieve the Government Hanway further suggested that merchants could employ more men without increasing their expense if they decreased wages in proportion to the number of seamen they added to their vessels and thus operated at the same cost.²⁵

The entire nation was already concerned about England's naval supremacy. Fielding and Smollett, among others, constantly urged half pay as an encouragement to disbanded officers, and many plans had been proposed to reward those in all ranks. These, for one reason or another, met overwhelming opposition. Half-pay for disbanded forces, however, seemed feasible to Hanway, and as early as 1758 he argued that if this money encouraged the discharged men of the navy to continue the skill they had acquired, the nation

²³ *Three Letters on the Marine Society*, Let. IV.

²⁴ *Reasons for 12,000 Mariners*, 25-6.

²⁵ *Three Letters on the Marine Society*, Let. IV, 11-12.

would benefit above the cost. At the end of the war 35,000 seamen and several thousand marines would be freed from duty. If shipowners discharged foreigners in their employ fifteen to twenty thousand veterans could be absorbed in English vessels.²⁶ The Government might offer twenty thousand others ten shillings a month on condition that they remain ashore for from eighteen months to two years, following which these sailors must make a voyage before resuming their pay. While these ideas were not immediately adopted, they show the good sense with which Hanway attacked the problems of his day and they reveal a continual effort on the part of eighteenth century merchants to evolve measures which would enable England to dominate world trade.

In these plans to enlist, clothe and train grown men Hanway and the Governors worked under the immediate necessity of winning the war with France and of maintaining English trade during a time of national stress. Concurrently the gentlemen remembered that they had organized for the purpose of assisting young boys to find employment at sea, where they could learn to become useful and independent. The permanent objects of the society were to remove

. . . those who are vagrants, pilferers, or by extreme poverty and ignorance are pernicious to the community; to encourage the industrious poor to send their children to sea; and to assist the captains and officers in the sea service . . .²⁷

They wanted to establish elsewhere those whose lives would be wasted in London, children who were bred to beggary as if it were a trade.²⁸

Charitable men and women of London, wrote Hanway, would appreciate the attainments of the society if they could

. . . see these boys, of whom some are infected with distempers which are the frequent attendants of extreme poverty; many are polluted with filth and covered with rags the very stench of which is pestilential: then to review

²⁶ *Three Letters on the Marine Society*, Let. IV, *passim*.

²⁷ *Letter from a Member of the Marine Society*, 7.

²⁸ *Dedication to Christian Knowledge Made Easy*.

them cured of those maladies, rendered clean and purified, dressed in the most proper clothing and made as new creatures.²⁹

Many youths appeared to have been stunted in their growth, "with shrivelled countenance as if they were born of parents who had received no other nourishment than gin."³⁰ Sometimes friends or relatives fortified a lad with alcoholic spirits before accompanying him to the office; sometimes they brought a bottle along. Seeing the disorder which this entailed, the society announced that no intoxicating beverage would be allowed and that any boy who had the fumes of liquor on his breath would be sent home.

When these urchins went aboard ship officers cherished them and trained them to become an integral part of the crew and worthy citizens of the nation.

The good officer considers them as a wise and tender parent does his own children; under such an officer the schoolmaster, or one who acts as such, teaches them the duty of a Christian as well as of a seaman, and initiates them into an early knowledge of what is proper for them; whilst the captain sees them kept tight in their clothing, and clean in their persons, and properly treated by his crew. And if there is any boy of uncommon genius it is but justice to the community to give him fair opportunities of improvement.³¹

To philanthropy like this no one ought to object.

Criticisms growing, as Hanway thought, out of misunderstandings of the society's principles and procedure, he was untiring in combating. When it was said that the gentlemen interfered with public authority he replied that they clothed no one for the war who had not been accepted by naval recruiting officers and that no one should object to such a necessary and non-profitmaking activity. Others argued that by its publicity the society encouraged sons and apprentices to run away to sea. To this Hanway replied that any parent,

²⁹ Hanway, *Motives for the Establishment of the Marine Society* (1757), 10.

³⁰ *Letter from a Member of the Marine Society*, 17.

³¹ *Letter from a Member of the Marine Society*, 9-10.

master or mistress could claim any son or apprentice discovered either at Mr. Fielding's or at the Seamen's Office, and that the Governors favoured severe punishment for any young man so found.³²

A third criticism of the society was that the gentlemen took boys away from the plough and sent them to sea. To this Hanway had two answers. In the first place the country lads who were clothed by the society were sent to London by rural magistrates. A country magistrate was not likely to send useful labour, but he was eager to rid his community of nuisances, and the boys he did send were excellent material for the navy. Hanway also pointed out that the society had as its primary purpose the rehabilitation of unfortunate victims of urban life. In 1757 the society advertised that it would not clothe lads from the country unless Fielding or the secretary had formally approved specific cases. The next year the Governors repeated the notice because boys from distant counties continued to arrive, and these had been sent against their will without the approval of the society. Such boys were always returned to the parish of their settlement. The gentlemen ventured to remind the public that, while the country needed men to prosecute the war, those selected for duty must be zealous as well as strong and agile. The society would not clothe those who were unwilling to fight, nor those with "distempers" or chronic weakness other than itch. The answers to criticisms were obvious. Because of a fear that misapprehensions on the part of the public would endanger their work, the Governors discussed all problems openly.

During the first few years of the society's existence the necessity of keeping the man power of the navy at a maximum prevented the gentlemen from placing the lads where they would be assured permanent employment at sea. Hanway therefore suggested that the society formulate some plan to shift their wards to merchant vessels as they were discharged from the warships.³³ If the lads adopted the sea before their

³² *Letter from a Member of the Marine Society*, 13-14.

³³ *Motives for the Establishment of the Marine Society*, 6.

minds and constitutions were fully formed, they would become so habituated to the labour and hardship that the duties of their trade would not seem irksome to them, and as seamen they would be a bulwark to English trade and to the nation's defence. When the war was considered won, in November 1762, the society voted to clothe only those boys especially recommended or sent by the magistrates, and to devote themselves to providing berths for those soon to be disbanded. As philanthropists they thought that

. . . it is right in itself, and equally just and politic, to convince the common people that when we send their children to sea we shall take all due care of them until they can take care of themselves; whilst we demonstrate to our fellow subjects in general that whoever applies himself to the sea, in this country, will deserve our most humane and serious regard.³⁴

Because the boys could not be placed as rapidly as they were discharged the society made a special arrangement with the Admiralty to keep them aboard ships at Portsmouth, Chatham and Plymouth for a period up to three months. The navy fed them, but the society furnished bedding; ordinary seamen always supplied their own.³⁵ Despite this provision the Governors heard that boys were lurking about the streets after ships had disbanded, and in February 1763 they ordered advertisements published in the *Public Ledger* and in the *Gazetteer* that the society would get good masters on sea or land for boys under sixteen who had been discharged from the navy and were in distress. The notice added that two hundred and fifty boys had been apprenticed "for the most part very happily."³⁶

This change in their enterprise led to new difficulties and to new attempts at fraud. Each master taking a boy was granted a fee of two guineas, and the society had reason to believe that some men were conniving with lads to obtain this fee by using false certificates of discharge. Money for the treasury was not now so easily obtained, for the country was at

³⁴ Dedication to *Christian Knowledge Made Easy*.

³⁵ *Minute Books*, March 20th, 1783.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, August 25th, 1763.

peace, and when Fielding urged that all young sailors in jail be apprenticed aboard merchant vessels lack of funds forced the society to refuse.³⁷ During the war boys had been placed easily, but now that they must all be apprenticed in trade a sufficient number of masters could not be found. Perhaps in part because Justice Fielding was known to send many petty offenders, the lads had come to have a bad reputation in London and, despite attempts to give them Christian training and to make them dependable,³⁸ only three hundred and eighty-seven were placed in new occupations at the end of the war.³⁹

To further the chief object of the society in apprenticing lads in the water-borne trades, in September 1764 the Governors advertised for masters, particularly those in the merchant service. The boys to be aided were, in the order named, those wandering, in distress, or in danger of crime; those whose parents were unknown or far away; orphan sons of soldiers and sailors; and the parish poor from within the bills of mortality. On June 1st, 1769 the secretary noted in the *Minutes* that eight boys were placed, but five times that number had appeared, and that the "situation of most of them might draw tears of commiseration, but that they derive a degree of contentment from the habit of misery." To these lads who would otherwise have no chance for a happy, healthy life the society furnished bedding, indentures, a book or two, medical care for the diseased and, to assure good treatment from the master, gave an apprentice fee. To prevent avaricious persons, as depraved as the notorious Brownriggs,⁴⁰ from obtaining numerous apprentices each master had to appear in person and someone known to a Governor had to vouch for his character. In limiting the scope of their work to boys from twelve to fifteen years of age, the group hoped to help three or four hundred annually.

In their plans to make their work permanent by establishing

³⁷ *Minute Books*, September 8th, 1763.

³⁸ Cf. Hanway, *Reflections on Mr. Hanway's Report to the General Court of the Marine Society* (n.d.), *passim*.

³⁹ *Minute Books*, March 16th, 1769.

⁴⁰ See *The Newgate Calendar* (Hartford, Connecticut, 1926), 171-81.

a reputation which would make their boys desirable employees, the Governors were eventually forced to oppose the efforts of Sir John Fielding. Although Sir John was pompous and vain, in relieving distress he was one of the most ingenious and industrious men in London. The quarrel seems to have arisen from Fielding's belief that the charity was his own idea (a claim immediately disputed) and that the waifs he sent from Bow Street, already in difficulties with the law, should be given immediate consideration for places. He assumed that the work of the society was limited to manning the navy in time of war and to removing from the London streets those youthful petty criminals who appeared before the magistrates. While this was a worthy conception it was not that of the men who governed the Marine Society. These men wanted to aid boys, virtuous and in distress, whose want might lead them to crime if they had no means of livelihood. Every active offender placed under the society's auspices increased the public distrust of all their apprentices, good and bad, and thus lowered their reputation for placing the kind of apprentices that masters wanted. In effect the society had outgrown its relationship with Fielding, and was becoming an organization to serve only the worthy poor.

On June 15th, 1769 Hanway called the attention of the Governors to several Bow Street notices in the newspapers "insinuating" that a small annual subscription—meaning enough to provide for Fielding's charges—would be sufficient thereafter for putting out boys to the sea. Then he read to the meeting a news article which he had prepared for the *Public Advertiser* and the *Gazetteer* on the present work of the charity. The point of this article was that the group found far more boys applying for help than masters desiring apprentices and that

. . . therefore all the suggestions occasionally thrown out to the contrary are the effects of gross ignorance or infatuation, or something worse, for they evidently tend to injure the cause of the public with respect to a provision for these objects, and . . . the increase of the maritime strength.⁴¹

⁴¹ *Minute Books*, June 15th, 1769.

Such words would not soothe Sir John, but the members approved publication.

At the meeting of October 18th, 1770 Fielding's name once more disturbed the Governors. He had written a letter to complain of an advertisement the society had published in relation to the boys sent from Bow Street, because this notice had implied that he interfered with their work. Fielding was annoyed at public depreciation of his well-meaning efforts. He reminded the society that in recent months he had sent only six or seven boys and that he had been careful not to send those from the country except the few whom he wished to prevent from becoming thieves. He was eager for his relations with the society to be amicable because he believed that they had a common purpose and that the group would find his suggestions and advice valuable. Charitable men contributed money to him for his use in aiding destitute youths, and this he was willing to turn over to the Marine Society. The gentlemen voted to accept the money with thanks.

Five days later, however, the society received another letter from Fielding to the effect that he was keeping the money until they had fully explained their previous notice in the newspapers. He was willing to refer the question of whether or not he had been wronged by their statements to a third person, suggesting Mr. Hyde of Charterhouse Square. The committee, on the other hand, felt that no further amends were due, and they had no desire to strengthen the relation of their work with the reforms of Justice Fielding. The Governors of the Marine Society thereupon

Resolved the above letter does not deserve any answer, especially as he has appealed to the public in the *Public Advertiser* of yesterday, wherein he publishes the society's letter to him of the 29th July 1756, and makes many remarks injurious to this society so far as to say that "this society ended with the last war" and that at present the institution "is called Sir John Fielding's preventive plan"—that he would pay in his subscriptions to this society "provided they would give him sufficient security for the permanency of *his* preventive institution and to supply him with their money to clothe boys as he pleased," upon the

whole depreciating this society as if he should be pleased to destroy the constitution of it.⁴²

In order that the public might understand the facts and remain friendly to the society the Governors decided to make their reply to the newspapers rather than to Fielding. The gentlemen wanted to make it quite clear that they were administering no one's personal charity—as indeed they were not. The dispute was annoying but of no lasting importance.

Within a very few years of its organization the Marine Society's reputation for practical benevolence led to their receiving frequent legacies. In 1763 Mr. Hickes of Hamburg, whom Hanway had met on his return journey from Russia, left the society £22,000. This bequest was immediately contested by a distant relative, the daughter of a butcher in Hertfordshire. The Governors offered to compromise their claims, but she hoped to acquire the whole sum through law. The authorities at Hamburg also tried to seize much of the property for themselves. Litigation lasted six years but eventually, in July 1769, the court decreed that the society receive £11,569 13s. 5d., an amount approximating the division the Governors had proposed. By the will, half the income was to be devoted, in time of peace, to clothing and obtaining positions for girls, a charitable work which continues to this day.

Because of the difficulties in collecting this legacy in 1770 Sir Gilbert Eliot urged the society to incorporate. Hanway believed this measure would lend the organization permanence and stability, would expedite the collection of future bequests (he knew of several), as well as induce other men to leave sums to the institution, and would assure the efficient custody of funds. Moreover, an incorporated society would have legal authority for indentures. The Governors voted favourably on the proposal and the process was completed in January 1772.⁴³

Once the society had incorporated, Hanway was made deputy-treasurer, thus giving official recognition to the position

⁴² *Minute Books.*

⁴³ *Ibid.*, *passim.*

he seems to have filled after 1757. After 1772 his signature confirmed the minutes and he handled much of the business detail. Drafts were drawn against him, and reference was made to sums as "per Mr. Hanway's Cash Book." His last signature appears on the minutes for the August meeting in 1786, only a week or two before his death.

The Governors of the society met once each year for a dinner. On one occasion the eighty-four gentlemen present consumed fifty-five bottles of port, thirty-eight bottles of Madeira, twelve bottles of sherry and one bottle of brandy besides twenty-two shillings worth of strong beer and ten shillings worth of punch. This, for the age, was a moderation of which Hanway would approve. Not only did he believe that men should never drink an amount which would befuddle their wits or excite their passions, but he was also convinced that charity dinners were so extravagant that they did much to defeat their own purpose. For example he observed that while the dinner for the distressed children of the clergy raised one thousand pounds, expenses amounted to at least four hundred pounds. To show that the cost was excessive, Hanway planned one of the annual banquets for the Marine Society at which he wine and dined one hundred people for about fifty pounds.⁴⁴

According to the *Minute Books* the dinner at the Crown and Anchor on February 14th, 1771 cost only eleven pounds, exclusive of wine, of which red and white port were provided. The bill of fare consisted of :

1 rump of beef.	3 dishes of fish.
1 sirloin of beef.	4 dishes of lobsters.
2 haunches of Portland mutton.	1 barrel of oysters.
2 hams.	3 dishes of roots and greens.
12 fowls.	3 plum puddings.
2 roast turkeys.	2 apple pies.
2 pigeon pies.	2 marrow puddings.

At this dinner the following stanzas were part of an ode sung

⁴⁴ *The Citizen's Monitor*, 275.

by the Westminster boys together with as many of those from the Marine Society as could be gathered :

Lo, the youths whom late you saw
Near perdition's gaping jaw
Now to happy lots are known ;
Britain now adopts her own.

.

Tho' the envious may repine
At a bounty so divine,
We with festive mirth will sing.
Pious mirth when such the spring.⁴⁵

The better poets of London were not members of the society.

In 1757 the society honoured Hanway and Fielding for their efforts by presenting each with a silver gilt anchor. The gentlemen later had a portrait of Hanway painted by Edward Edwards and Thornton gave them his by Gainsborough, both of which may now be seen at the offices of the society in Clark's Place. Hanway is depicted as a small man seemingly full of nervous energy. While the expression of the face, and especially of the eyes, is such as to draw immediate attention, several gentlemen requested that changes be made in the eyes and wig. Hanway thereupon had a miniature made for each of them and the portrait was corrected.

Through his work in the Marine Society Hanway became acquainted with groups having similar purposes and assisted in organizing their work. In 1758 he became a steward of the Stepney Society, an older charity started by ship masters after the Dutch War as a means of apprenticing the sons of sailors. Perhaps through Hanway's influence the stewards that year decided to cease clothing servants for the King's navy and thereby to increase from sixteen to twenty-six the number of youths annually placed in trade and to add a coat, a pair of breeches and a hat to the usual apprentice fee of five pounds. In 1759 Hanway was elected treasurer of the society and wrote for its benefit the *Rules and Orders of the Stepney Society and Moral and Prudential Instructions to Apprentices*, by which he hoped to attract subscriptions for the society.

⁴⁵ *Minute Books.*

In his "prudential instructions" to these lads Hanway included one bit of advice which seems odd, coming from a bachelor. The boys were told to

. . . be careful and industrious and you will be enabled to marry at so much an earlier time of life; and as this will the more easily preserve your innocency, which must ever be your first care, you will also become so much the better subject and the better citizen, and probably live most comfortably. Idleness or pride, or wickedness are generally the cause why so many marry late, and so many do not marry at all.⁴⁶

His advice to the Stepney apprentices was calculated to produce sober, pious, industrious lads who would become "better subjects" and "better citizens." His last words admonished the boys, when grown, to be charitable and to aid parents and needy kindred.

Prayers and admonitions suitable for the Stepney children were equally appropriate for all boys and girls. From time to time Hanway made minor changes and emendations in this pamphlet and reissued it with an individual title page recommending it to enlisted men, to servants, and to those apprenticed by the various groups with which he worked, such as the Marine Society, the Foundling Hospital and the Maritime School.

Hanway repeatedly advised his readers to marry early and to rear large families, yet he obviously had no intention of marrying. To prevent misapprehension as to his plans, he carefully dedicated his books to two or three ladies at a time lest any one think herself the object of special regard. As a disinterested observer intent on all things practical, he nevertheless believed himself qualified to advise everyone on marital problems and the proper management of the family. In *Midnight the Signal* (1779), for example, he included correspondence—probably imaginary—between himself and a "lady of quality," in which he guided the lady through the difficulties of training a daughter and getting her suitably married.

⁴⁶ *Moral and Prudential Instructions*, 31.

Year by year Hanway grew better informed on the problems of the various maritime employments. Gradually he became convinced that the system of training officers in the navy by apprenticing the sons of gentlemen aboard ship was inefficient. Not only did he believe that this was a slipshod way to teach navigation, but he thought that the training did not instil the "proper religious awe" necessary to an efficient officer. France, on the other hand, gave instruction in academies from which Hanway believed its navy derived great benefit.

The idea of naval academies was comparatively new and their utility unproved in England. In 1704 Lewis Maidwell, offering to endow a school for navigation with five hundred pounds a year, had gained approval from the Admiralty Board and the Prince of Denmark for a plan which, among other details, required six foreign languages for the study of the arts and sciences. No school was organized at this time, but by the late 'seventies a few institutions had arisen to train youths for the sea.⁴⁷ There was then the royal foundation school at Portsmouth taking twenty to thirty scholars; the Greenwich Hospital School for the sons of common seamen; Christ's Hospital School, training Londoners for the merchant service; and the Hatton Garden School to train some "artists" for the sea, but not for the navy.⁴⁸

In March 1779 a group of men already active in the Marine Society—John Thornton, Peregrine Cust, Pugh, Blizard, Glasse and Hanway—opened the Maritime School on the banks of the Thames with an enrolment of eleven students. The first President was Lord Hawke, who was succeeded by the Duke of Cumberland. The Governors had cleaned and furnished an old house in Paradise Row, Chelsea, to receive as many as twenty-six boys with the necessary officers and servants. To further the project Hanway wrote

⁴⁷ In 1705 also Neale's Mathematical School was founded to train boys as apprentices for the Royal Navy. This school still exists at St. Dunstan-in-the-West, Fleet Street, although its connection with the Navy has ceased.

⁴⁸ Hanway, *Rules and Regulations of the Maritime School on the Banks of the Thames near London* (1781), *passim*.

an *Account* (1779),⁴⁹ *The Rules and Regulations of the Maritime School* (1781) and a *Letter to the Governors* (1783?).⁴⁹

Of the twenty-six boys for whom the Governors planned, thirteen sons of sea officers were to be admitted on the foundation; six orphan sons of officers or boys from large families on payment of sixty guineas; and seven sons of noblemen, officers or gentlemen on payment of fifty pounds *per annum*. Each candidate, if he had not had smallpox, must be inoculated; and he must be able to read, write and work a problem in mathematics "in the rule of three"; less scholarly preparation, said Hanway, would be as likely to defeat their purpose as would the admission of those who were imperfect in limb or understanding. To start the school the Governors admitted some lads at the age of nine, but the intent was to take the boy at eleven or twelve and to keep him only to the age of thirteen. At the latter age, when the youths would be eligible for the navy and a share of prize money during wars, all should be ready for service.

Within the school an ex-lieutenant of the navy and a superintendent for morning and evening devotions were responsible for discipline and progress in studies. A matron cared for the rooms, food and laundry, and sat at the head of the table during meals to hear the grace, keep order and see that six verses of the Bible were properly read at dinner and at supper. Masters taught navigation, mathematics, reading and writing, French, drawing and surveying coasts in the method used at sea. The boys also studied the use of firearms and artillery; they familiarized themselves with the masts, sails and rigging of a ship built in the playground. To aid instruction and discipline the school issued sixpence pocket money a week to each boy and forbade anyone to return from either of his two-week vacations with over a half-crown. In March 1781 Hanway as treasurer gave each lad a copy of *The Polite Preceptor* "to animate these young men in their pursuits and give them a respect for themselves." When a youth was ready to leave the school he was furnished with a number of prayers

⁴⁹ These books I have not been able to find.

and a hymn to memorize, besides being advised to maintain a sense of religious duties and obligations among his men and to keep his ship clean and well ventilated.

The plan for the Maritime School had obvious advantages, and patriotic citizens subscribed liberally. Even the Government in Bombay sent one thousand and seventy pounds, which had been collected there. Throughout the country agents forwarded money to London, just as they did for the Marine Society. The school seemed so certain to be permanent that the Governors hoped the navy would deduct the time spent under their training from the six years of service required for a lieutenancy. A "certain personage" among the Governors promised to use his influence toward this end, but he delayed doing so until Hanway, eager and impatient, himself applied to the First Lord of the Admiralty. This independent action gave such offence to the Governor and to his friends that many subscriptions were not renewed. Hanway and the masters in charge worked energetically, but in 1783 all efforts failed and the school closed.⁵⁰

In another effort "to diffuse the naval spirit" Hanway announced to the Marine Society on December 19th 1782 a plan for County Naval Free Schools which he wished the gentlemen to sponsor. By this scheme he hoped to co-ordinate efforts to relieve the poor and to make England self-supporting, as well as to reform the navy and to maintain its supremacy.⁵¹

Briefly, Hanway wanted to set aside one hundred and fifty acres of waste land in each county and on this to build a house for the accommodation of one hundred boys. These strong lads were to reclaim the land; if they produced food valued at approximately five pounds per acre, the farm would be self-supporting. These boys should be chosen from among the kind that the Marine Society was then aiding; that is, sturdy and honest youths who were likely to be driven astray both by penury and by their natural daring. In these County Naval Free Schools they would be trained to husbandry as

⁵⁰ Pugh, *Life*, 207-8.

⁵¹ *Proposal for County Naval Free Schools to be Built on Waste Lands* (n.d.), *passim*.

they worked on the farm. At the same time they would help to supply the food of the British nation and would become more healthy than in the city. If a ship was placed in each playground the boys could be taught seamanship in their hours of relaxation and thus be ready for duty on either land or sea. Intra-mural and inter-scholastic competition would inspire the boys with zeal to excel in their work, while the regular discipline would make them worthy subjects very early in life.

From early childhood these lads would receive daily training in frugality, industry and piety, the duties and obligations fitted to persons in their station of life. Through their education the boys would develop into some of the country's best workmen and most valiant warriors, and thus the Schools would set an example to the numbers of people who habitually neglected youth. A means of self-help would be given to thousands who faced the tragedy of living in the midst of misery, idleness and neglect with no power to gain subsistence from the earth. At present, argued Hanway, city children could not cultivate the soil, were unused to manufactories and therefore became so useless that politically and economically the nation might be better if they did not exist. He himself had known parents to beg when their children, eight to thirteen years of age, earned not one penny. Another advantage of moving these lads to the country would become evident when boys from the fields composed the future army and navy. If city men were strong, able and willing, they were too valuable in industry to be sent to war. Hanway thought that under his plan the nation could reclaim wasted land and wasted lives as well as assure defence in war.

To show that his scheme was feasible Hanway proved that it could be financed at no added cost to the ratepayer, while it should eventually save him much of the money he contributed to the support of the poor. The common land belonged to the nation and counties could pay for buildings by the method of the Norfolk Houses of Industry. To erect these houses wealthy men lent money to a parish, which it would later repay through savings in the poor's money.

Hanway quoted figures presented to the House of Commons in 1776 to the effect that the country spent £1,500,000 annually in provision for the poor, most of whom were physically able to contribute to their own support. For centuries the real problem of poor relief had been to force all able-bodied paupers to productive labour. Hanway argued that his system of schools would not only provide a means to independence but would also discourage shiftlessness by training the boys to become valuable workmen.

That more people might know of his project Hanway wrote, and the Marine Society published and distributed two hundred and fifty copies of *A Proposal for County Naval Free Schools to be Built on Waste Lands* (1783 ?). Because this was a bulky volume not likely to be generally read he wrote *An Abstract of the Proposal for County Naval Free Schools* in 1783. These books revealed in detail the plan of a model school. Here were pictured the implements suitable to a boy's strength; the cross-section of a ship with all the parts named, such as he would use in the study of seamanship; and hymns which Hanway had written⁵² in order that the lads might express the various joys of fruitful labour. His morning invitation to rise was designed to convince the sleepy-head that all was right with the world:

See, with rosy banners streaming,
Young-ey'd morn ascend the skies!
Why, my messmate, art thou dreaming?
Awake, my boy—my friend, arise!

Hanway was thoroughly convinced of the merits of his proposal. Naval officers approved the plan and suggested that the experiment be tried first in a few counties in order that others might profit by possible mistakes.⁵³ Then Hanway endeavoured to arouse the Governors of the Marine Society to enlist the aid of their friends and to interview members of Parliament, but his enthusiasm to found a "nursery for seamen" was not sufficiently contagious to overcome public doubt.

⁵² He set religious words to popular tunes of the day.

⁵³ Hanway, *Observations on the Proposal Made by Edward King*, 4.

To-day we can see a steady development of England's naval and commercial supremacy from the time of Hawkins and Drake. The interest of Englishmen in the brave new worlds discovered by hardy sailors increased national pride and widened all horizons. At the beginning of the eighteenth century the sea had become a highway for trade. Defoe's captains, merchants and pirates, who won fortunes in their business through long voyages, respected the sea as a powerful opponent, but they did not love it. Roderick Random was not happy in the navy, and travellers did not regard a voyage by sea as healthful. In eighteenth century literature the sea was usually regarded as a means to an end. Seamen perforce pursued their affairs from one end of the earth to the other; they improved or invented mechanical devices until the boats became comparatively safe. When the sea had been conquered and men could expect to return from a cruise to China, thousands of people felt Don Juan's wonder and awe at a shipwreck. They understood the danger but escaped the fright of earlier adventurers at sea.

Since 1756 the Marine Society has integrated itself with the development of the nation. As the years went by and other groups formed societies to rehabilitate the wayward, the Governors turned more and more toward the training of sailors, and many lads once aided by the Marine Society would now be sent elsewhere. The decision to accept only those applicants of unquestioned honesty and ability has proved wise, for the boys' good reputation helps each of them and enables the Governors to be more useful. Present requirements for admission are high, higher than those of prospective employers, and both moral and physical training given on land and sea invite more applicants than funds or available positions will admit. Accommodating itself to changing conditions the Marine Society is as useful and vigorous as ever, quietly training orphans and children of the worthy poor to sail the seven seas and to defend the tight little isle from any enemy.

When the Governors meet to discuss their present business, John Thornton considers each decision from his portrait at the

end of the room. Near the table, pen in hand, Jonas Hanway seems to watch proceedings eagerly, making notes in order that others may know what worthy efforts are made for the public good.

CHAPTER V

THE MAGDALEN HOUSE

IN London, wrote Hanway, three thousand prostitutes walked the streets and, every year, three thousand men and women—one in two hundred and fifty persons—died from venereal disease.¹ Prostitutes themselves generally died before they reached the age of twenty-four, and girls from twelve to sixteen years of age “half eat up with the foul distemper” were a not uncommon sight. Young men of London doubtless sympathized with Boswell in his fear that a night’s excesses might be followed by a lingering, horrible death.

Many eighteenth century authors introduced harlots on their pages to delineate the contemporary scene. Lady Vere and Lady Hamilton were notorious; Johnson assumed that the average nobleman did “keep his whore” and that French quack doctors grew wealthy curing the French disease.² Roxana and, to a lesser degree, Moll Flanders were “fortunate” mistresses whose counterparts could be seen strolling in the park or attending the theatre. The London public would understand why the experienced Mrs. Bennett should wear the innocent Amelia’s mask to the assembly,³ and readers would feel that Miss Polly and Miss Biddy Branghton received the insults they deserved when they slipped into the dark walks of Vauxhall without masculine protection.⁴ The protection, moreover, needed to be both vigorous and dependable: army officers insulted Amelia with impunity while she was accompanied by two clergymen, but they apologized humbly when she was joined by Captain Booth; and Evelina was in

¹ *A New Year’s Gift to the People of Great Britain, Pleading for the Necessity of a More Vigorous and Consistent Police; the Connexion of Public Happiness with Religion. With Several Proposals Respecting Education and other Salutary Regulations* (1784), xx-i; hereafter referred to as *New Year’s Gift*.

² *London*.

³ *Amelia*.

⁴ Fanny Burney, *Evelina*, Let. XLVI.

positive danger when she rode home in a coach with Sir Clement Willoughby. When Lord Orville hastened to the Mirvans to assure himself that Evelina had arrived safely he revealed a concern for helpless women which his contemporaries would not expect from a casual acquaintance. To Mr. Villars he had proved his worth :

Doubtless he thought there was much reason to tremble for your safety, while exposed to the power of Sir Clement ; and he acted with a regard to real honour . . . in so immediately acquainting the Mirvan family with your situation. Many men . . . would have quietly pursued their own affairs, and thought it more honourable to leave an unsuspecting young creature to the mercy of a libertine than to risk his displeasure by taking measures for her security.⁵

There were streets in London in which modest women hesitated to appear alone at any hour of the day.⁶

To an age which assumed that women must have masculine protection whenever they ventured forth from their lodgings, the attitude of men toward unaccompanied women was perhaps not as important as the danger inherent in having three thousand prostitutes preying upon the drunken and unwary and assisting in any nefarious scheme proposed. A merchant might plan and slave throughout his life in order to found a fortune only to have his son contract loathesome diseases and die before he did. The Millwood revealed in *The London Merchant* might wreck any business by seducing employees and apprentices ; prostitutes, like Millwood, would have no reason for remorse at having brought disaster upon others.

Hanway, the Fieldings, and other earnest men who were eager to reduce prostitution and its accompanying evils found the law and the police almost helpless ; at the same time, an honest justice like Fielding might be accused of being corrupt because the offences continued. In 1773 Sir John asked Garrick to close *The Beggar's Opera* because its performance

⁵ *Evelina*, Let. XXIV.

⁶ William Augustus Miles, *A Letter to Sir John Fielding, Knt.* (1773).

so incited the disorderly that every time it was acted one additional thief was hanged. Garrick refused, and Miles published *A Letter to Sir John Fielding, Knt.*, in which he advised the blind justice that there was sufficient crime in his own district to keep him fully employed. Regardless of the *Opera*, wrote Miles, eight of ten hanged at Tyburn owed their ruin to vice in the neighbourhood of Bow Street, a seat of debauchery. Fielding himself lived quietly within a few doors of a bagnio, and people of London agreed with Roderick Random that justices either owned the city's bordellos, shared in the proceeds, or had reason to protect those who did. Against this charge Sir John might have pointed to his reputation as the only honest justice then in London and have stated that the law could not function without the co-operation of citizens, for he could not act against any bagnio until "informations" had been laid against it. On the other hand, if Fielding had made this reply to Miles his Bow Street neighbours would have reminded him that they dared not inform until there was a greater respect for the power of the law to preserve order, for the whole criminal population would join with the bawds to mete out quick, drastic revenge. Until the citizens enforced a reform the police were almost helpless. Prostitutes would continue to walk what streets they pleased or to advertise themselves in the theatres, which admitted them without charge. (Perhaps Dr. Johnson remembered this last when he told Garrick he would no longer come to the Green Room because the bare flesh of the actresses excited his passions.) Women recognized the danger of being captured and paraded by prostitutes at such places as "Marybone" Gardens and of being embarrassed at giving their address as "in Holborn."⁷

Because there was no immediate prospect that Londoners would enforce any discipline to protect themselves from harlots, philanthropists saw that the success of any project to reform and rehabilitate these women depended upon the zeal of individuals united in a society of public-spirited men. In 1750, therefore, Robert Dingley proposed to Hanway that

⁷ *Evelina*, Let. XLVI.

they should found an institution to help those unfortunates who had fallen into mental and physical wretchedness and were eager to repent. Although Hanway was searching for worthy enterprises he thought that his aid would not prove useful because a man of forty was too young to engage in a charity which was certain to attract the witticisms of the beaux and fops. Hanway always feared the laughter of society. At this time he encouraged Dingley to continued efforts, but he declined to work actively himself. In 1751 Johnson's *Rambler*⁸ printed a letter suggesting that because prostitutes were completely abandoned by society, they were especially pitiable objects for charity. Although this letter was reprinted in the April issue of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, no charity was formed immediately. Dingley made slow progress in organizing the Magdalen House; he struggled for eight years before he succeeded in interesting a sufficient number of men to found a "hospital."

By 1758 Hanway had overcome his earlier squeamishness and was ready to devote his pen to a new project with the same vigour he was then exercising for the benefit of the Foundling Hospital and the Marine Society. He was one of a group of men who wrote pamphlets to awaken the interest of the general public in such philanthropic institutions. Hanway published "A Letter to Robert Dingley, Esq."⁹ and *Thoughts on the Plan for a Magdalen House*; Dingley published *Proposals for Establishing a Public Place of Reception for Penitent Prostitutes*, also printed in 1758. The same year John Fielding gave the movement the use of his name and influence. His *Account of the Origins and Effects of a Police Set on Foot by His Grace the Duke of Newcastle in the Year 1753* summarized the reforms he had already instituted as magistrate at Bow Street,¹⁰ following which he urged the

⁸ *The Rambler*, March 19th, 1751.

⁹ *Three Letters on the Marine Society*, Let. V.

¹⁰ *First*, he had destroyed the gangs of street robbers; *second*, he had caught many of the highwaymen near London; *third*, he had sent house-breakers and the lead and iron thieves to Tyburn or the Colonies; *fourth*, he had transported shoplifters, pickpockets and pilferers; *fifth*, he had rehabilitated the ragged, abandoned boys who lay about under bulks and in ruined, empty houses.

public to join with him in an attempt to diminish prostitution. Fielding observed that, just as deserted little boys

. . . become thieves from necessity, their sisters are whores from the same cause; and, having the same education with their wretched brothers, generally join the thief to the prostitute.¹¹

Pointing out that most inmates of brothels were under eighteen years of age—the majority were between twelve and sixteen—Fielding proposed that little girls be given a means of support before they were driven to their last resort. Marchant's *Observations on Mr. Fielding's Plan for a Preservatory and Reformatory* and the *Plan to Remove the Nuisance of Common Prostitutes from the Streets of this Metropolis* by Saunders Welch, Fielding's chief constable, also appeared in the spring of 1758.

At first the men interested in these pamphlets intended to form one institution by combining the best ideas of the various plans, but as the discussion continued the sponsors divided into two groups. One decided to follow Fielding in establishing the Female Orphan Asylum, which would act as a "preservatory" by supplying a means of self-support to desolate little girls while they were yet virtuous. For these Fielding rented a house where they could open a laundry, because washing clothes seemed the most suitable industry for the girls' unskilled labour.¹² A laundry was more likely to be profitable in 1758 than it would have been a half century earlier, for cotton goods were replacing woollen garments. Members of the new generation, calling on the witty Lady Mary Wortley Montagu when she returned to London after years of living abroad, were astonished that a woman of her rank should wear dirty clothing.¹³ In her youth, however, one washer-

¹¹ John Fielding, *Account of the Origins and Effects of a Police* (1758), 43.

¹² Ronald Leslie-Melville, *The Life and Work of Sir John Fielding* (1935), *passim*.

¹³ Horace Walpole in his *Letters* (October 8th, 1761) wrote: "I have not seen her yet, though they have not made her perform quarantine for her own dirt."

woman had been sufficient for the sixty-three persons in the royal retinue of George I.¹⁴

In the other group Hanway, Robert and Charles Dingley, John Thornton, Robert Nettleton, Thomas Preston, George Wombwell and John Dorrien collected subscriptions for an institution in which prostitutes might repent of their sins, recover their health, and be trained to earn an honest livelihood. Within a few weeks this committee had received pledges for three thousand pounds, whereupon they rented a house in Prescott Street, Goodman's Fields, and admitted the first eight women on August 10th, 1758.¹⁵

The formal government of this hospital was similar to that of the Foundling and the Marine Society. The Earl of Hertford served as President and Lord Romney, Sir George Savile, Sir Alexander Grant and Sir Samuel Fludyer assisted as Vice-Presidents. John Thornton was treasurer. After having ruled that no officer was ever to divulge information concerning any inmate, the Governors elected a general court, a general committee and a sub-committee. These groups framed policies, heard complaints and transacted the more important business of the institution. To care for the women the Governors elected by ballot a chaplain, matron, assistant matron, physician, surgeon, apothecary, steward, secretary, porter and messenger. Only the matron could administer punishment either by force or by confinement, and her assistant was obliged to maintain a continual supervision of their charges. Any inmate could leave the house at any time she desired.

The Governors found many women eager to avail themselves of this opportunity to reform their manner of living. While many sturdy citizens held aloof from the enterprise under the notion that it was a Methodist scheme governed by "enthusiasm," the officers were soon enabled to cite figures which proved that they were doing something to correct a notorious evil. Of one hundred girls admitted, "a

¹⁴ According to Lewis Melville (*Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, 1925, 103), in 1696 two washerwomen sufficed for the three hundred persons, exclusive of royalty, in the court at Hanover.

¹⁵ Pugh, *Life*, 174.

seventh part had not reached their fifteenth year, several were under fourteen, and a third of the whole had been betrayed before that age."¹⁶ On March 31st, 1761 Hanway noted that ninety-eight women were then in the house, and that a total of two hundred and ninety-one had been received :

. . . 27 have been reconciled to their parents; 82 placed out in reputable families as domestic servants; 4 have died; 10 proved lunatic or distempered in mind (supposed to be occasioned by mercurial physic) and sent to St. Luke's Hospital or their proper parishes; 9 dismissed at their own request upon good terms and a prospect of being accommodated so as to live virtuously; 10 seemed well inclined, but could not brook the way of living within walls; 41 their conduct proved them unworthy of the charity.¹⁷

By 1786 the house had admitted two thousand, four hundred and fifteen women. Of this total sixty were then in the Magdalen; one thousand, five hundred and seventy-one had been reconciled to friends or placed in service; and the others had died, proved incorrigible, or been discharged at their own request when they found themselves unable to submit to the house discipline.¹⁸

During the early years of the hospital, after money had been collected and officers for a permanent foundation had been chosen, Hanway published books and pamphlets to explain the objectives of the original Governors to the public, to discuss thoroughly the reasons for each decision of policy and practice and to advise all interested persons on the measures which he thought would prove most efficacious in the future. Because of the delicacy of the project everyone concerned attempted to be extremely circumspect in promoting it, for the public was inclined to associate any aid to harlots with vicious indulgences and to regard such assistance as very nearly an insult to virtue.¹⁹ Therefore, when in his first comments Hanway made the common error of assuming

¹⁶ Gray, *History of English Philanthropy*, 164.

¹⁷ *Reflections, Essays and Meditations*, II, 504.

¹⁸ Pugh, *Life*, 175.

¹⁹ C———'s *Candid Remarks on Mr. Hanway's Candid Historical Account of the Foundling Hospital*, *passim*.

that Mary Magdalen had been a harlot and thus elicited a blast from the clergy,²⁰ he considered his mistake almost tragic. He humbly retracted in his next book, then repeated the facts known about her in pamphlet after pamphlet in order that no one else slander a woman of unimpeachable honour.²¹ Hanway believed, however, that as a good Christian Mary Magdalen would gladly have lent the patronage of her name to aid the institution.

When the Governors had searched for a suitable house which they might rent to use as a hospital, they had faced immediate opposition from parish officers, who did not want such an institution located within their boundaries. Tax-payers feared the institution because they believed that the length of time which a harlot must spend in a house to complete her reformation would be sufficient for her to gain a settlement in the parish, which must then support her. Some men believed that, for the house to keep patients long enough to assure readjustment to a new life, the women would have to be indentured as servants. Indentures for less than five years were not legal, and no one ever planned to support the unfortunates for that period. Hanway argued in restrained disgust that the men who raised these objections were creating difficulties and pointed out that public hospitals kept their patients indefinitely without anyone assuming that residence entitled them to a settlement. Moreover, if a woman had to be indentured before she would submit to discipline she was not ready to reform.

As the Governors proceeded with their plans the more philanthropic citizens realized that London had needed a Magdalen House for generations and that Continental cities had founded such institutions centuries earlier. The "Windsor goose" had been notorious in Shakespeare's London, the gay blades commenting that much of the bishop's income came from rent on bagnios. In collecting all available information

²⁰ Nathaniel Lardner, *A Letter to Jonas Hanway, Esq., in Which Some Reasons are Assigned, Why Houses for the Reception of Penitent Women Ought Not to be Called Magdalen-houses* (1758).

²¹ *Vide Three Letters on the Marine Society, Thoughts on the Magdalen House*, and succeeding books.

before attempting to begin their work, Hanway's committee found that a Magdalen House had been founded at Rome in 626; at Marseilles in 1272; at Naples before 1325; at Metz in 1452; at Paris, Rouen and Bordeaux in the fifteenth century; at Seville in 1550 (also in New Spain); and at Amsterdam in 1596.²²

Perhaps the Governors of the Magdalen remembered that those who planned the Foundling had received from the officers of foreign institutions many suggestions which proved to be impracticable in England, for Hanway discussed in detail the features of foreign hospitals which his committee had rejected. At Amsterdam, for example, inmates were exhibited to the public on payment of an admission fee. Although the insane at Bethlehem Hospital were subject to this same curiosity, Hanway believed that making a spectacle of repentant harlots would not incline them toward sober, industrious ways of living. At Amsterdam vicious young women might be held in private apartments until their guardians believed that their passions had become more stable. But pious men in London would recoil from an institution with this provision, for they would assume that it was a device by which rakes might dispose of inconvenient wives or by which parents and guardians might force young women to courses bitterly distasteful to them. At the moment any Londoner could name men who, having married women of fortune, had shut these young wives up in an insane asylum or in a private institution.²³ In Hanover George I had thus removed his consort when she succumbed to the charms of a wandering knight. Smollett was working with materials in the common knowledge of his readers when Mr. Darnel and Mr. Sycamore shut up both Aurelia and Sir Launcelot Greaves in the madhouse of Mr. Shackle in order to force Aurelia to marry the inconsequential Mr. Sycamore. London police had been known to lay siege to a house in their efforts to free a young wife whose parents were sufficiently influential to force official action.

²² Hanway, *Reflections, Essays and Meditations*, II, 10-15.

²³ R. Bayne-Powell, *Eighteenth-Century London Life* (1937), 242.

While Hanway thought that the customs at Rome were probably better than those of London, he knew that Englishmen would not adopt them. When a Roman woman was first detected in soliciting on the street the authorities allowed her to choose between going to a house for penitents and entering her name on the public register as a prostitute. If she chose the latter she was segregated and subject to rigorous regulation.²⁴ Hanway inclined to the belief that the evil would be less in London if the city forced harlots to a separate quarter, because the women could then be better attended when they were ill or diseased. Many, like the Miss Williams succoured by Roderick Random, hid away in a garret to die. If harlots were sequestered, shame might prevent youths from frequenting their district.²⁵ The people of London would suffer no more from publicly admitting and enduring the existence of one infamous quarter than they did in ignoring the fact that harlots roamed all the streets and solicited at every public place of assembly. While this was a reasonable approach to the problem, Hanway submitted to the English prejudice against segregation; for he knew that his contemporaries would not officially recognize the existence of harlots in their country since this would give them a public status.

Although both Fielding's "preservatory" and the Magdalen opened their doors in the same year many men believed that the Magdalen should also admit distressed women who were not known to be harlots. They wondered if limiting rescue work to the completely degraded was not in effect an invitation to sin for those who were merely desolate. Hanway answered these objections by pointing out that this hospital was a charity designed to remedy only one of the many existing evils and that other eleemosynary institutions should furnish relief and a means of self-support to those in simple distress.²⁶ In 1758 Hanway hoped that efficient workhouses and groups formed to assist the poor in finding employment

²⁴ Hanway, *Thoughts on the Magdalen House*, 34, 38-9.

²⁵ *Three Letters on the Marine Society*, Let. V.

²⁶ *Thoughts on the Magdalen House*, 26.

would make even Fielding's asylum unnecessary;²⁷ a girl who was not known to be a prostitute had a reputation good enough to be able to find work. Surely no woman would "become a prostitute because she may have an opportunity to repent of having been so . . ." ²⁸

Hanway argued not only that the house must limit its efforts to actual repentant prostitutes, but also that those admitted must be less than thirty years of age. A harlot at thirty was an old woman who could not support herself by honest labour either in the Magdalen or in private industry. She was at this age likely to be a bawd or a procuress. Because such women were inclined neither to repent themselves nor to sympathize with others less hardened to shame, the inmates of the Magdalen must be protected from them, lest one bawd interrupt the penance of all.

Since the Governors intended to admit no one to residence in the house until she was free from disease the more tender-hearted people felt that "penitent prostitute" was too severe an appellation for healthy women living cleanly.²⁹ A more pessimistic group believed that women habituated to an abandoned life would be incapable of self-discipline, if not completely ungovernable. To Hanway, if the best security against evil was a sense of shame, the women should be reminded of their exact status. On the other hand the officers could proceed only on the assumption that the harlots sincerely desired "repentance with the hope of temporal ease and comfort, if not happiness."³⁰ While the chaplain would certainly have a difficult task even after the women were separated into like groups, the Governors must seek the mean of common sense which lay between the sentimental and the brutal. Eventually inmates would or would not win moral regeneration through their own hard work and prayer.

In determining many questions of policy and procedure the Governors considered the origins of the women concerned.

²⁷ *Thoughts on the Magdalen House*, 52.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 26.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 26; also *Reasons for Twelve Thousand Mariners*, 4.

³⁰ *Rules and Regulations of the Magdalen House* (1768), 15.

Almost all had been victims of dire poverty and the vicious demoralization of life in city slums. Fielding, knowing the seamy side of London perhaps better than any man of the time, wrote :

Infinite are the number of chairmen, porters, labourers, and drunken mechanics in this town, whose families are generally too large to receive even maintenance, much less education, from the labour of their parents; and the lives of their fathers being often shortened by their intemperance, a mother is left with many helpless children to be supplied by her industry, whose resource for maintenance is either the wash-tub, green-stall or barrow. What must then become of the daughters of such women, where poverty and illiterateness conspire to expose them to every temptation? And they often become prostitutes from necessity even before their passions can have any share in their guilt.

And as beauty is not the particular lot of the rich more often than the poor, many of the above mentioned girls have often great advantages of person; and whoever will look amongst them will frequently see the sweetest features disguised by filth and dirt.

These are the girls that the bawds clean and clothe for their wicked purposes. And this is done to such a degree that on a search night when the constables have taken up near forty prostitutes, it has appeared on their examination that the major part of them have been of this kind, under the age of eighteen, many not more than twelve, and those, though so young, half eat up with the foul distemper.

Who can say that one of these poor children had been prostitutes through viciousness? No. They are young, unprotected, and of the female sex, therefore become the prey of the bawd and debauchee.

Here I cannot help mentioning a misfortune—nay, I may say a cruelty—that often happens to these deserted children, and I believe the offenders as often go unpunished, for the maternal tendernesses of their mothers are either starved by their necessities or drowned in gin, and for a trifle conceal and forgive an offence which our laws have made capital. And I have sometimes seen mothers, but indeed they ill deserve that name, who have trepanned their children into bawdy-houses and shared with the bawd the gain

of their own infant's prostitutions. And scarce a Sessions passes without indictments being found against porters and such low sort of men for ravishing the infants of the poor . . . ⁸¹

When Richard Cumberland's *West Indian* was first produced the audience accepted the fact that the sentimental hero, Belcour, relied on the procuress, Mrs. Fulmer, to obtain Miss Dudley, just as it applauded his changed intent when he learned that she was chaste. In the play neither Stockwell nor Miss Dudley censured him for his action. Defoe wrote of "fortunate" mistresses, perhaps not only because these were more interesting to his readers, but also because the literal truth would be too depraved and squalid to be endured in print.

Pamphleteers complained that, under the system of sending petty offenders to workhouses, these "seminaries of vice" trained "unfortunate women, trembling perhaps with compunction for their first indiscretion," to be "sent out into the world quite hardened and matured in all the mysteries of iniquity." ⁸² In *Amelia* Blear-eyed Moll welcomed Booth to jail with something less than delicacy; if Amelia herself had appeared Moll's greeting would undoubtedly have been too offensive to print.

While the London slums supplied most of the prostitutes the misfortunes of these women were too commonplace for the public to demand measures of reform except in individual cases of extreme and startling distress. The public was always interested in a glamorous Nell Gwynne or in a Lavinia Fenton's becoming a duchess. These, however, were quite able to provide for themselves and were not known to suffer many qualms of conscience. Men and women were also touched by a feminine version of the Fall of Princes theme. In attempting to arouse the interest of those who might contribute money or industry to the benefit of the Magdalen House, therefore, Hanway particularly stressed the need of women who had been reduced to poverty after having been

⁸¹ Sir John Fielding, *Account of the Origins and Effects of a Police*, 44-6.

⁸² Edmund Gillingwater, *Essay on Parish Workhouses* (1786), 15-16.

reared in comfort. He called the attention of his readers to the numbers of prostitutes who were "the daughters of poor tradesmen, or of clergymen of poor livings in the country who, during their father's lifetime, are company for the Squire and frequently debauched by him."³³ Two years earlier (1766) Goldsmith had portrayed Olivia Primrose as suffering just this fate. The reading public might remember that Moll Flanders had been seduced by the eldest son in the house where she was a companion of the mother and daughters, that Mrs. Ellison had betrayed Mrs. Bennett in the same manner in which she attempted to betray Amelia, and that Booth's friend, Captain Trent, had offered his own wife to settle a debt before he suggested the same solution of a difficulty to Booth.³⁴ Although Ferdinand Count Fathom seduced the "fair Elenor" when she came to London to work at a milliner's, this Elenor was not as unfortunate as many country girls, for Hanway wrote that both the police and the public knew

. . . a set of fellows, supposed to be ministers of justice, employed in inquiring after handsome girls that are a little in debt, and if they can contrive to buy up their notes, perhaps at a crown in the pound, they arrest them, detain them at their house in quality of a sponging-house, and make their property of them. The debt, perhaps two or three pounds, still remains if they were to earn them a hundred pounds; so that they are never after out of their clutches till they are rotten and unfit for service, when they are cast into the streets.³⁵

In *All in the Wrong* audiences saw Lady Restless accuse Mrs. Tattle of bringing fresh-faced country girls to the house for the pleasure of Sir John, and her suspicion was as natural as any incident in the play. Hanway proposed, as the simplest way of destroying the power of the bawds, that the courts link them with gamblers and refuse them legal aid in the recovery of debts.

If those discharged from the Magdalen were not to relapse

³³ *Rules and Regulations of the Magdalen House*, 29-30.

³⁴ *Amelia*, *passim*.

³⁵ *Thoughts on the Magdalen House*, 43.

into their former manner of living and if the house itself was to be a permanent foundation, the women must obtain some kind of security after their cure and conversion. The best security was marriage, which Hanway thought the charity ought to encourage by providing dowries to those ex-prostitutes who had come to excel in virtue.³⁶ In Amsterdam Dutch sailors frequently sought wives from the Magdalen House, and the English might discover that their own seamen would be pleased with a reformed wife if she had both a dowry and a trade, for not all men were equally exacting. During the first few years, however, the Governors were forced to place most of the women discharged from the Magdalen as servants in London homes despite the fact that almost any other honest means of livelihood seemed preferable. Hanway's objection to placing women in service was that London families had become lax in maintaining Christian training and discipline, for comparatively few families required the whole household to assemble daily for morning and evening prayer. Furthermore the servants' table was supplied with the same quantity and quality of food as that of the master, and the moral courage of a woman was likely to be weakened by succumbing to the temptation of eating to excess. Gregarious servants drank quantities of beer when the evening's work was done, and a woman leading a monotonous life might fall an easy prey to her excited passions. The Governors of the Magdalen House much preferred to have their wards learn a trade, and if it became necessary, Hanway thought the institution should provide materials and pay wages to lodging-workers, thus freeing them from temptation.³⁷

The Magdalens must learn trades, but the Governors were perplexed to find what they could do. They applied to the Society for Encouraging Arts, Manufactures and Commerce for suggestions, specifying that the employments must be those for cheap, unskilled labour; and Hanway investigated the efforts made by Chesterfield in conjunction with the society in Ireland, from which he reached the conclusion that

³⁶ *Three Letters on the Marine Society*, Let. V, 16-17.

³⁷ *Rules and Regulations of the Magdalen*, 35-6.

blind paupers could be taught to earn their livelihood by weaving.³⁸ Someone remembered that a manufacturer had formerly recommended that foundlings over ten should be trained in carpet-making. Although the Governors observed that the women 'did this work quite easily, Hanway expressed some fear that by encouraging this employment the House was contributing to contemporary extravagance and high, luxurious living. Nevertheless, carpets "certainly contribute to ease and comfort as well as elegance, and are at least as proper as a fine apartment or any other rich furniture, not to mention the sums we pay for them to foreigners."³⁹ In this last the Magdalen weaving was justified, for if the English bought carpets they should encourage the domestic manufacture and, if possible, create a surplus for export. Following much the same reasoning, Hanway wondered if the Magdalens could be taught to mend silk stockings as skilfully as the Italians did, for the English generally worked at this so awkwardly that they hesitated to wear those in which the threads had once been broken. In one way or another these women might contribute to the national welfare by keeping at home the money Englishmen habitually spent abroad for luxuries.

Just as little Betty (Moll Flanders) plied her needle industriously when faced with an apprenticeship at kitchen drudgery, the Magdalens laboured at such simple trades as they could learn. Among their employments Hanway mentioned making clothes, bone lace, black lace, artificial flowers, toys, embroidery, millinery, mantuas, gloves and garters; also knitting, weaving and silk-winding, weaving hair for peruke-makers and making ladies' and children's shoes. At the time all charities encouraged home weaving and sewing as a means of self-support and, sadly enough, the philanthropists were thus making life even more precarious for the genteel poor who worked with needle and loom, because these were undersold by women whose livelihood was partly or wholly assured.⁴⁰

³⁸ *The Citizen's Monitor*.

³⁹ *Three Letters on the Marine Society*, Let. V, 14.

⁴⁰ Gray, *History of English Philanthropy*, 165.

While the Magdalen House was wholly concerned with the physical and moral rehabilitation of women who had previously been abandoned by society, Hanway, as he observed the rigorous discipline under which these former harlots were regaining their self-respect, believed that they were setting an example from which all women could profit. In the last analysis women must regard decency as an individual problem, but Hanway considered it his duty to warn the people as a whole that

. . . if there was less idleness among the working female poor, there would not only be fewer prostitutes, but fewer beggars and fewer thieves; there would likewise be a heavy expense in the Poor's Rate saved. The indulgence of feeding young girls and young women who do not work is a mark of false tenderness, and sometimes renders charities instrumental to debauchery.⁴¹

He was thoroughly convinced that a "wholesome restriction of females, directed by reason and mixed with tenderness such as shall not seem to violate any freedom common to rational creatures" (unless this freedom was in danger of being abused) was "necessary to the virtuous harmony of life."⁴² Before men allowed their daughters to be instructed in such decorative accomplishments as dancing and the French language, they should provide against misfortune by forcing each to learn a trade at which she could be self-supporting. If necessity never required her to practise it she would still be better informed for the purpose of supervising her servants and thus prevent them from wasting their time.

According to the *Rules and Regulations of the Magdalen*, published by Hanway at the end of its first decade, the repentant women lived frugally and spent every waking moment in industry and religious contemplation. Each one admitted was given a light grey uniform to identify her with the institution. Thereafter she was known only by her given name, her surname being the sworn secret of one Governor; even

⁴¹ *Thoughts on the Magdalen House*, 47.

⁴² Hanway, *Thoughts on the Use and Advantages of Music, and Other Amusements Most in Esteem in the Polite World* (1765), 17; hereafter referred to as *Use and Advantages of Music*.

visitors were warned against revealing the family of anyone they might recognize. When first registered the woman was kept in a separate quarter of the house where she submitted to the routine discipline until the officers were positive that her desire to repent was sincere. After serving this period of probation she moved to a ward occupied by other inmates of similar birth, breeding, education and conduct; the Governors believed in rigid class lines even among ex-prostitutes, for levelling was neither possible nor desirable.

Any Magdalen might sever all connection with the outside world during her reformation, for visitors were not allowed to inspect the inmates to discover if someone they knew was present; an interview could be arranged only after permission had been granted both by a committee member or Governor and the Magdalen concerned. If a Magdalen answered when a visitor's name was announced and the authorities granted permission for a conversation the chaplain must always be in the room. Furthermore, the women were allowed neither to send nor to receive letters until these had been read by the committee, the chaplain or the matron. When the doctors or the apothecary called, the matron or her assistant attended throughout the visit, for Hanway wrote that not even a Governor should be allowed to visit the women alone or without written permission from someone else in authority. To be successful the officers must not tolerate light or unbecoming behaviour from anyone connected with the charity but enforce an attitude of high seriousness. Hanway was pleased that even the town wits had refrained from merriment at the expense of the Magdalen.

In summer all the inmates of the house rose at six o'clock, in winter at seven. By the time they were dressed a bell called them to prayers, which were brief and simple in order that the women might listen attentively. After this service the women worked an hour before sitting down to their breakfast. Here they found bread, water-gruel, milk, milk-porridge, bread with butter, or possibly cheese, a menu which would be repeated at supper. After this frugal meal, which was meant to be even coarser than they might expect to eat elsewhere,

they worked until noon. Then they were served broth and meat, with small beer to those who wanted it; "roots and herbs" in season might be added to these meals when—and if—the physicians approved. After dinner the women rested for an hour and a half, then worked until dark, which was supper time. Soon after this meal they were called to evening prayers, which they must complete before they became drowsy and inattentive either from food or the late hour. At ten o'clock each woman went to her separate bed with its running curtain on one side, a curtain meant to assure her only that privacy necessary for prayer. As an individual under this regimen each Magdalen must attempt her own salvation.

In considering this programme Hanway came to the conclusion that it might be rendered even more effective if one woman read pious tracts or the Bible while the others worked or ate. The foundation could purchase a small collection of books on morality, devotion and history, and the chaplain might take the responsibility of teaching each to read well. With this training the women could instruct themselves and maintain their virtue when they went back into the world; this worthy pursuit would fill the hours of relaxation which they might otherwise spend in idleness, gossip or dangerous levity. Not only would this reading improve the mind and character of each Magdalen, but it would also prevent her being embroiled in political and social contentions with which her lesser understanding was unable to cope. So long as a liberal government must tolerate the presence of men like "that devil Wilkes," responsible citizens must train the labouring classes to shun all discussions of public policy and to put their dependence entirely in their masters and mistresses.⁴³ Like My Uncle Toby's armies, governments were "the getting together of quiet and harmless people . . . to keep the ambitious and the turbulent within bounds."

Because the Magdalen House was successful in its work, philanthropists began to urge that further experiments be tried and that the general scope of its activities be widened. Hanway was opposed to these suggestions. First, any expan-

⁴³ Hanway, *Virtue in Humble Life*, *passim*.

sion might lead to unfavourable reactions from the public, as had happened with the Foundling. There an early spectacular success had led to an excess of "enthusiasm," which had proved just as harmful as a widespread indifference. Secondly, because in their good judgment they had already evolved a successful treatment for the women, the Governors should be extremely cautious in adopting new ways which might prove futile. The officers, Hanway believed, should limit themselves rigorously to their first purposes and principles.

As a whole Hanway recommended the Magdalen House not only because it restored abandoned women but also because it improved the tone of life for the people of London. First, by stopping the progress of venereal diseases, the house saved the lives of a number of subjects; second, by checking libertinism it prevented misery and confusion among the lower classes; and thirdly, Hanway believed that reforming prostitutes would proportionally increase the number of marriages and thus save many souls.⁴⁴ Furthermore, England needed a larger population to do its work and to fight its wars; therefore the country should "assist the virtuous, countenance foreigners, and encourage matrimony." While everyone admitted that this was true, men unthinkingly encouraged depopulation not only by accepting as axiomatic the theory that a soldier should not marry and that a sailor would not, but more positively by discharging servants who wed, rather than run the risk of having to care for their progeny or being inconvenienced by them. Soldiers, sailors and servants were as eager to wed as any other class of people, argued Hanway, and men had a patriotic duty to assist them in rearing large families.⁴⁵

Writing again in the 'seventies on the necessity of encouraging early marriage in order that the poor might have greater

⁴⁴ *Thoughts on the Magdalen House*, 12-13.

⁴⁵ *Observations on the Causes of the Dissoluteness Which Reigns among the Lower Classes of the People. Also an Account of the Marine Society, the State of the London Workhouse, and the Usefulness and Piety of the Magdalen Hospital* (1772), hereafter referred to as *Causes of the Dissoluteness*, and *Virtue in Humble Life*, *passim*.

stability and that there might be an increasing number of children in the country, Hanway expressed a belief that the Marriage Act (26 George II, c. 33) had created so much immorality among the poor that the country might be forced to demand its repeal. By passing a law that banns must be read before a marriage ceremony would be legal Parliament had intended to destroy the gangs of men and women who preyed upon drunken heirs, inveigling them into marriage with harlot accomplices. Before 1753 these Fleet marriages had been as common as they were notorious, and the Fleet parsons had been quite irresponsible even when they had not been in league with fortune hunters. Faced with a charge of bigamy and in danger of losing control over his wife's property, Ferdinand Count Fathom discovered that a Fleet parson could conveniently forget having performed a ceremony of which there was no record and to which the witnesses had been partisan. In real life Dr. Keith had ordinarily married six thousand persons each year and was so furious when the Government interfered with his trade that he threatened his own revenge. " 'Damn the bishops,' he exclaimed, 'so they will hinder my marrying! Well let 'em. I'll buy two or three acres of ground and under-bury 'em.' " ⁴⁶ An enforced delay between notice of the intention to marry and the actual ceremony prevented inveigling and hurried elopements which the bride or groom might live to regret, and Hanway thought that among the poorer classes it also resulted in the man and woman ignoring the ceremony in a moment of passion, following which the man refused to abide by any of his promises. When the girl was left with a bastard to support, she resorted to prostitution and debauched her neighbours. In thus reminding his readers that man's affections are fickle, Hanway followed noteworthy examples among his contemporaries. In *Pamela* Richardson regarded chastity as at least a necessity for a good marriage, if not a *quid pro quo*; and if one may judge from Mr. Smith's conversation with Evelina, Fanny Burney believed that Miss Biddy Branghton would do well to restrain the young man if

⁴⁶ Bayne-Powell, *Eighteenth-Century London Life*, 54.

he became too amorous, "really there is no resolving upon such a thing as matrimony all at once; what with the loss of one's liberty and what with the ridicule of all one's acquaintance . . . after all, my dear Ma'am, marriage is the devil!"⁴⁷ Hanway's opinion was that universal chastity would compel all men into a marriage of some kind, which would result in more orderly living and an increased population.

Although Hanway insisted that the Magdalen House must limit its work to the rehabilitation of harlots, he believed that men could work through other institutions to curb the related evils of prostitution. One group of men founded the Misericordia Hospital in order to dispense medicines and prescribe treatment for the cure of venereal disease among the poor. In November 1774 Mr. Blizzard, an active member of both the Marine Society and the Magdalen, requested Hanway to serve as treasurer of this hospital because, as he said, no other suitable person would take the office. Hanway consented only on the condition that the Misericordia should practise "the science of prevention . . . and the soul [be] attended to as well as the body."⁴⁸

During the few years that charitable contributions enabled this institution to maintain its work it relieved many sufferers. By 1780 it had treated one thousand, four hundred and sixty-five patients, among whom were one hundred and seventy-one married women, three hundred girls under twenty years of age and about forty destitute and penitent prostitutes.⁴⁹ The great majority, however, were labourers, sailors and other men who had become penniless through the robbery of quack doctors. The best doctors had little knowledge of possible cures and the quacks were likely to be men like Ferdinand Count Fathom or Dr. Ferret,⁵⁰ whose equipment for their profession was a quick wit, a bedside manner and a kit of

⁴⁷ Let. L.

⁴⁸ *An Account of the Misericordia Hospital for the Cure of Indigent Persons, Involved in the Miseries Occasioned by Promiscuous Commerce* (1780), ii; hereafter referred to as *Account of the Misericordia*.

⁴⁹ *Account of the Misericordia*, 81-2.

⁵⁰ *Sir Launcelot Greaves*.

tools and nostrums. For those who could afford the treatment, physicians prescribed mercury for syphilis, but since they knew neither the proper amounts nor the need for continuing the dose, diseased persons usually died insane or "stunk above the ground," like the libertine peer in *Amelia*. Gonorrhœa could be checked after a fashion. Mr. Wilson suffered three attacks during his wild years in London,⁵¹ Mrs. Bennett passed to her husband an infection which she had contracted from the libertine peer,⁵² Roxana had been forced to go into retirement for some weeks,⁵³ and John Wilkes advised travelling diplomats to remain continent.⁵⁴ If we can rely on Hanway's estimate that, of the seven hundred thousand persons in London, three thousand died every year from these "consumptions," almost half of one per cent died annually of venereal disease. The well-to-do would presumably have full benefit of such treatment as there was but the poor could go only to quack doctors, buy "cure-all" patent medicines, and die. For the poor, and ultimately for all classes, the Misericordia was a very necessary charity; if it had continued it might have been as valuable a laboratory for the discovery of new treatments as the Foundling had been for advancing pediatrics.

It may seem strange to the modern reader that Hanway, having already sought and obtained changes in the laws to protect infants in workhouses and waifs who were apprenticed, should make no effort to do so for little girls ranging from twelve to sixteen years of age. Like Sir John Fielding, he must have seen many "half eat up with the foul distemper." The explanation probably lies in the fact that he realized that eighteenth century society could not be brought to support an Act if he had proposed it. As late as 1885 Parliament was violently opposed to such a measure, though a commission of the House of Lords had reported in 1881 that the evils common in Hanway's lifetime still prevailed. Little girls of thirteen could still be violated with almost no hope of redress,

⁵¹ *Joseph Andrews*.

⁵² *Amelia*.

⁵³ *The Fortunate Mistress*.

⁵⁴ *Letters of John Wilkes*, The Guildhall Library.

and procuresses obtained them for libertines at prices ranging upward from three pounds.⁵⁵ If a Victorian Parliament had to be driven to reform, no one under George III could have overcome the Government's refusal to interfere. At that time any legislation to protect the unfortunate was suspect; to pass, it must benefit the wealthy. Such people as Hanway and Hannah More could work only toward moral regeneration; and even their appeals for charity might be halted as Johnson squelched Boswell for defending Lady Diana Beauclerk, "Sir, . . . the woman is a whore, and there's an end on't."

⁵⁵ Frederic Whyte, *Life of W. T. Stead* (New York 1925), I, *passim*.

CHAPTER VI

THE WORTHY POOR

HANWAY realized that the poor in workhouses and in the care of various charitable institutions, in immediate need of assistance and discipline, comprised only a small percentage of those who suffered privation; in the long run he could render more effective patriotic service by assisting to maintain in their independence those who, after a fashion, supported themselves. Obviously these labouring poor needed advice in utilizing their resources, for except under a peculiarly dishonest overseer, the standard of living in workhouses was not below that in the homes of many industrious working men. Parishes estimated the cost of supporting the poor at from four to six shillings a week for each person; districts having no workhouses contracted with employers to support paupers at this rate, plus whatever labour the charges could be prevailed upon to perform. The workhouse, of course, reduced its average expense on such items as rent, taxes, fuel and even food.¹ An independent labourer, free of the workhouse, earned one shilling and sixpence for a day's work, or nine shillings each week. To this wage Hanway supposed that his wife and children would add nine and one-half pence daily. In other words a man, his wife and their three children earned thirteen shillings and ninepence weekly and could spend two shillings and ninepence in support of each member of the family. The individual, therefore, lived for a year on an expenditure of seven pounds, three shillings and fivepence, or six shillings and five pence less than Parliament had appropriated for each child in the Foundling Hospital.²

Until 1760 both wages and living costs seem to have risen slowly. After this date, however, the price of food increased rapidly. Because wages remained stable or increased tardily

¹ *Serious Consideration on the Parish Poor*, 27.

² *Letters on the Rising Generation*, II, 190-3.

the distresses of the poor multiplied, and much larger sums had to be collected and disbursed under the Poor's Rate. Taxpayers thereupon complained bitterly and demanded greater economy from the overseers. When these complied many indigent persons abandoned hope of relief from the parish and submitted to cold starvation. In 1763 a renting agent took a prospective tenant to inspect a house then occupied by five women in Stone Cutter Street in London. In a room on the first floor they found the naked body of a woman; on the second floor another; and in the garret the three survivors huddled together in the last stages of starvation. Upon inquiry the men discovered that these were respectable women who had been forced to sell their clothes in order to buy food. The youngest had lost her health in working at one of the colonies for babies and at the Spitalfields silk mills, after which she had applied for, and been refused, aid from the parish. The older women had thought it hopeless to apply either to the parish, to the hospitals or to any organization. Although their case was of course extreme, they were probably right in their conclusion.³

Although the complaints of the poor were rising in volume and the percentage at which the number of burials in London exceeded the number of christenings increased by one-third between 1753 and 1766,⁴ the necessity of underselling the French and the Dutch in a world-wide market complicated the problem of maintaining the labouring class. Inasmuch as "history can hardly furnish an instance in these latter times of a considerable trade being carried on by traversing the dominions of a foreign prince," economic and political power seemed to be linked.⁵ After the Dutch had been defeated in the seventeenth century England turned to almost continual war with France. At the same time the East India Company was gradually driving the French and the Dutch out of India, the army had won almost the entire continent of North America, and seamen had re-discovered Australia and the

³ Bayne-Powell, *Eighteenth-Century London Life*, 81.

⁴ *Letters on the Rising Generation*, II, 127.

⁵ Dedication to Nettleton, *Account of the British Trade*, II, iv.

islands thereabout and claimed them for the British crown. As France had assisted a large portion of North America to gain independence from England, so the British Government, as the Spanish Empire weakened, came to encourage the formation of republics in order that South America should not fall into the hands of the French. Merchants knew that either the English or the French would dominate the world in the next century. Hanway therefore suggested that English merchants monopolize the trade in British possessions and make sure that the superiority of British merchandise demonstrated the superiority of their system of government elsewhere. From a mercantile point of view both the rich and the poor had a common patriotic purpose in expanding British trade and the best interests of the two classes were identical.

In order that the common people might understand where their best interests lay, most of Hanway's books after 1760 stress religion, obedience and industry:

Though you are born to an humble estate in this world, let your AMBITION rise as high as heaven itself: there direct your hopes. . . . But you can hardly be honest unless you are industrious: and would you be a good man, you must add to industry and religion good nature, or a happy temper. Thus you will insure happiness . . .⁶

Hanway granted that those "who clamour loud and breed riots" might be "sometimes in the right in substance," but "in the manner of showing it, they generally make the remedy worse than the disease."⁷ Willing submission would advance their interests and would encourage officers in the performance of their duty. Those in power were sincere men who gave up their own peace of mind for the common good.⁸

At the same time Hanway felt that the labourers must be assured a standard of living which would maintain their strength. Long before Carlyle he wrote that those who

. . . know what freedom means should understand that

⁶ *Moral and Prudential Instructions*, 35.

⁷ *Virtue in Humble Life*, II, 334-5.

⁸ *Ibid.*

whenever the lower classes of the people become poor to an extreme of wretchedness, they are apt to contract the same inclinations and indolence as those who live under despotic governments; and from being so depressed are rendered the more indifferent even to life. Whenever this happens to be the case, their strength will decay, they will be less active and laborious than when their spirits were kept up by such a distribution of the bounties of heaven as may be expected from just government and the humanity which this should inspire among individuals.⁹

The rich and the poor, all responsible citizens, must work to co-ordinate the nation's business.

Although the poor complained that they were always hungry, ragged and cold, Hanway rather inclined to the belief that their difficulties arose, not from inadequate purchasing power, but from misapplication of their funds, especially in that they consumed excessive amounts of food. To make sure that the poor had no just cause for complaint he prepared a budget sufficient for the needs of a working man for one year :

	£	s.	d.
Bread, $1\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. daily @ 1d. per lb.	2	5	7
Cheese, 3 oz. @ 4d. per lb.	1	2	10
Meat, 4 oz. for 6 days in the week (or roots, vegetables, etc. @ 3d. per lb.)		19	6
Clothing, per annum	1	4	0
Soap, Candles, Cottage and other articles	1	0	7
	<hr/>		
Total living expenses, per annum	£6	12	6 ¹⁰

In 1766-7, when he compiled this table, bread sold at one and one-half pence per pound, and Hanway therefore added £1 2s. 9d. to make a total of £7 15s. 3d. On the other hand he wrote that "some do not eat $\frac{3}{4}$ lb. of bread, nor expend above 15s. in clothing." He observed as another fault in his table that he had allowed nothing for "beer, which is an essential article to his health, as well as the joy of his heart;

⁹ *Virtue in Humble Life*, II, 310.

¹⁰ *Letters on the Rising Generation*, II, 190-3.

he will drop his bread and die, rather than [be deprived of] his beer." Hanway probably based this budget on the menu in workhouses and on Bailey's *Treatise* on these institutions.¹¹

If this budget met the needs of a single man a family of five could live on the combined earnings of the husband and wife, especially after the children passed their infancy and were able to assist. Hanway offered his recipe for a soup which would prove nourishing and enable poor families to economize still further. Seasoned with salt and pepper, an ox-head, peas, bread, oatmeal and any available roots and vegetables were to be boiled together for three and a half hours. A pint of this would satisfy the hunger of each person served. When the poor objected that the concoction was not palatable and that ox-cheek was not fit food for men, Hanway was angry at "the ignorance, as well as the arrogance of some of the poor."¹²

So small was the margin between his budget for a family and their combined earnings that Hanway recognized that, for the poor, subsistence depended upon food prices remaining stable. Furthermore, if "these people are obliged to spend their gain in providing food, they will be kept very bare in clothing."¹³ Forgetting the foreign market for a moment, Hanway argued that if workmen could not buy clothing manufacturers could not sell their goods, and city industries would be ruined by the greed of country squires. Hanway warned the people of London that this danger must be "attended to" by regulating the price of provisions. He was as convinced as Goldsmith that the landowners were a menace to the State.

In 1767 Hanway could already see the effect of rising prices as the poorer classes changed their diet to accord with their reduced means. Although working men were learning economy in a hard school, he thought that everyone still ate more than was necessary and that the country was impoverished by the steady waste. In 1737, according to

¹¹ See the anonymous *Account of Several Workhouses* (1732).

¹² *The Citizen's Monitor*, VIII.

¹³ *Letters on the Rising Generation*, II, 100-1.

Maitland's *History of London*, the inhabitants of Greater London enjoyed an average consumption of ten ounces of bread daily; in 1767 Hanway estimated the average at thirteen ounces. In 1737 London required 98,244 cattle and 711,123 sheep, including lambs; in 1767 the greater population bought only 72,800 cattle and 676,000 sheep. In 1767 Hanway estimated that the people ate a quantity of pork, veal, lamb and poultry equal to the mutton; Maitland stated that in 1737 the people used 194,760 calves, 52,000 pigs and 186,932 hogs.¹⁴ Hanway thought the 700,000 people in London consumed on an average seven ounces of meat daily, "enough to impoverish the richest country upon earth and is, I suppose, more than thrice as much as is consumed by the same number of people on any [other] spot on this globe."¹⁴ Foreigners expressed the same belief. As a fact in common knowledge Hanway reported that wealthy families, including the servants, consumed on the average, twenty ounces of meat per person each day. Henry Fielding wrote that Amelia and Mrs. Atkinson sent out to a tavern for a cold chick to divide between them and for "two pound of cold beef for the serjeant."¹⁵ To protect the food supply Hanway advised everyone to refuse lamb and veal, and farmers to save female animals for breeding. If women cooked meat and vegetables together, they would not only double or triple the meat's food value but they would also protect themselves from the scurvy. While people were eating less meat than they had in 1737 they still ate more than the country could afford.

In 1767 Parliament ordered the commissioners in the Supply Office to test the various grades of flour bought by the navy in order to determine what standards the contractors must meet. As one of the commissioners, Hanway learned that Parliament had never succeeded in regulating the millers, and that the legal grading of flour as established in the reign of Anne, had resulted in abuses which forced Londoners to eat bread which was sourer, less healthful, and more expensive than necessary. While the millers pretended to divide the

¹⁴ *Letters on the Rising Generation*, II, 192-3.

¹⁵ *Amelia*, Book VIII, Ch. IV.

flour into grades of white, wheaten and household or brown, the household flour was so bad that even the poorer classes refused to buy it. As might be expected, since one grade cost as much as the others to manufacture, the millers adulterated the good grades with seconds or middlings; yet with proper grading flour could be sold at nine per cent less than it then was. Furthermore, millers mixed old wheat with the new because the old absorbed more water, and bakers then added alum in order to impress the customer with the bread's whiteness. An "unnamed physician" told Hanway that half the children dying in England had a lump of undigested flour in their bodies. Matthew Bramble, homesick, described London bread as a "deleterious paste, mixed up with chalk, alum and bone ashes," adding that the butchers, by "villainous arts," had bleached veal until it was "so void of all taste, nourishment and savour that a man might dine as comfortably on a white fricassee of kidskin gloves, or chip hats from Leghorn."¹⁶

Hanway, thinking that the public should benefit from the navy's inquiry, included a digest of the commissioners' discoveries and recommendations in his *Letters on the Rising Generation*. Parliament, however, did not revise the law until 1773, at which time a new "standard" flour was legalized, bread from which must be sold at 7d. a quartern loaf. This was to take the place of the old "wheaten" flour in general use, a loaf of which had then sold at 8d. in most bakeries. The price set by Parliament was too low for the millers and bakers to profit, so millers refused to bring flour to the city, and the law was generally ignored. In his *Great Advantage of Eating Pure and Genuine Bread* (1773), therefore, Hanway recommended that the price be increased one farthing and that his readers patronize certain honest bakers, like the Mr. Moore who "seems to believe in God."¹⁷ Gradually the quality of bread improved, but Hanway continued to remind the public that they were purchasing bad flour if their bread became inedible on the second day.

For another "necessity" Hanway had no praise. Tea

¹⁶ *Humphry Clinker*, Letter to Dr. Lewis, London, June 8th.

¹⁷ p. 58.

seems to have been introduced in England about 1656, when sixteen ounces of the rare leaves cost between five and ten pounds. Englishmen delighted in the new beverage, and each year the price decreased as larger quantities were imported from China. Much of the witty conversation for which the reign of Queen Anne is famous took place while men and women were gathered under its friendly, social stimulus. By the time Hanway returned to London from Russia all classes of people had developed a taste for tea. Six ships annually sailed to China for cargoes, which now sold in English shops for from four to six shillings a pound. Because he was interested in foreign trade, national economy and the welfare of the poor, Hanway was almost certain to investigate the effect on the English people of this comparatively new "necessity."

He came to the almost immediate conclusion that purchasing tea was destructive both to foreign trade and to the country's resources. English goods were not shipped to China in exchange, but the cargoes were bought outright by gold and silver from England. (A generation later English cotton and silk undersold those of Indian and Chinese manufacture.) English money and bullion were essential to expedite both the domestic and foreign trade. Furthermore, a thoughtful people recognized that a country grew wealthy by selling more to other nations than it bought, for both economic and political power rested with that government which was itself independent of foreign supplies at the same time that its produce was necessary to others. A nation did not fight the people upon whom it depended for food and manufactures. Not only was this true, but a sensible government guarded and increased its store of gold and silver in order that it might hire soldiers and maintain its armies in the field during frequent emergencies of war. The English, Hanway thought, must be particularly careful in maintaining their supply, for they must fight the French until one country or the other was hopelessly ruined; meantime, however, they were not only sending their money to be buried in China but were also paying it to French smugglers, thus aiding their enemy and annually defrauding the Government of two million pounds

in taxes (one-half for tea alone).¹⁸ Where England had once been able to supply sugar for the foreign market, the careful French had now taken over this trade because the English wasted their product in sweetening a useless drink. Tea in England was a menace to trade and Government.

Of course the Chinese had adopted the beverage from a need to purify their drinking water, but what was its value to Englishmen? Because the Chinese used only the best bohea themselves and exported the inferior grades, English shop-keepers frequently dyed the leaves to make them sell, and women just as frequently brewed the drink in unlined copper kettles. Tea in England, therefore, was generally poisonous.¹⁹ English camomile was a better emetic, and English beer, milk and water more nourishing and healthful. "The hot water and sugar ruined the digestion."¹⁹ Moreover, most people thought the drink must be served with buttered bread, which was equally harmful: "It is amazing to consider how pernicious this is to the digestive powers of some persons, and can never be good at any time for all kinds of constitutions."²⁰ And not only were tea, butter and sugar unhealthy, but they were luxuries which many people in every county could not afford. Butter, for example,

not many years since . . . was deemed an article of luxury; it was not common to domestic servants in families of rank; but now, if the labouring part of mankind are not supplied with it at 6d. or 8d. a pound they think the times are very hard.²⁰

The poor who yielded to this new fondness for tea must increase living expenses almost one-fourth beyond what Hanway estimated was necessary and proper. The hours they spent around the tea table were hours devoted to idleness and gossip from which the country could not profit.

The "Essay on Tea" in which Hanway first published these opinions was added to the second edition of his *Journal of an Eight Days' Journey*, an unfortunate place for an

¹⁸ *New Year's Gift*, *passim*.

¹⁹ "Essay on Tea," *Eight Days' Journey*, *passim*.

²⁰ *Letters on the Rising Generation*, II, 184.

unpopular thesis. The book had first been written at the suggestion of a group of ladies with whom Hanway had travelled by coach from Portsmouth, his birthplace, to Kingston. As they rode along Hanway had characteristically attempted to profit from the hours spent and led a conversation on religion, patriotism and morality, illustrating each point by reference to beliefs, fashions and foibles taken from his reading or his experience. For example, he cited society's current fashion of lavishing time and affection on pet monkeys, a waste of talent which Hanway thought would meet grave disapproval in Heaven. The ladies in his party believed themselves so improved in character by the various discourses that they asked Hanway to keep a journal, as he had done on his journey in Russia, and to publish the full account of the trip. Thus others could share their benefit. This Hanway did; but when he found that the critics disapproved of the volume he withdrew it, revised the manuscript and brought out a second edition with the "Essay on Tea" in the following year (1757).

The critics still condemned the book. Hanway seldom improved a volume in revising it, and the second edition may have been worse than the original. Samuel Johnson, having acceded to a request not to review the first impression, thought that the second printing was dull, stupid and ridiculous. Perhaps he couched his review in more withering terms because Hanway had achieved some literary fame by his *Account of the British Trade* and was presumably capable of writing well. Fearing death as Johnson did, he may have been unpleasantly affected by Hanway's constant references to that ordeal and to the anguished remorse of sinners on Judgment Day. Certainly he was annoyed by the bad grammar and by the attacks on his favourite beverage; he was living proof that tea was harmless, for if it were poisonous he must long since have succumbed or become a pale shadow of his sturdy self. The references to death and disease among the infant poor of London Johnson did not think as worthy of the consideration of a Governor of the Foundling Hospital as was the need for imparting a knowledge of religion to those already under the hospital's care. When Johnson had visited

the grounds, the children had been unable to answer the simplest questions from the catechism; he thought it reprehensible to preserve the lives of innocent children and then withhold instruction without which they must be damned in eternity. Hanway's morality Johnson did not, of course, attack—"he is a man whose failings may well be pardoned for his virtues"—but he clearly implied that the *Eight Days' Journey* was one of the least inspiring among all the moral tracts available to the reading public.²¹

Hanway, furious at this scathing review, published an angry letter in the *Gazetteer* on May 26th, 1757. This letter I have not been able to find, but perhaps, from Johnson's "Reply"²² and a general knowledge of Hanway's convictions, its general tenor may be reconstructed with some accuracy. Hanway seems to have reminded Johnson that the author of the *Eight Days' Journey* was no Grub Street hack, to be kicked around by heedless, malicious and ill-informed critics. He was a successful merchant of wide experience and thorough practical preparation for his task. Mr. Hanway was, moreover, a man of property who kept his own carriage and moved as an equal among important people in such enterprises as the Foundling Hospital, where he assumed those responsibilities proper to a gentleman and a Christian. He denied Johnson's accusation that the Governors of that institution had failed in their duty; religious training had always been rigorously maintained there, and the critic had maliciously represented the children as ignorant when they were only overawed and bashful in the presence of their visitor. Hanway had based his conclusions in regard to tea on facts and figures, while the argument of his "antagonist" was "founded in FANCY and OPINION."²³ Indeed "no one sits down soberly to defend" tea "except in the habit or evil practice of drinking it."²⁴ In defending the beverage, Johnson had pandered to his own desires, heedless of the national welfare. On the other hand, in publishing moral discourses calling attention to fashions and foibles which

²¹ *Works*, II, 389-404.

²² *Ibid.*, II, 406ff.

²³ Hanway, "Essay on Tea," *Let.* IV, 217.

²⁴ *Letters on the Rising Generation*, II, 186.

seemed to him evil and in seeking to establish principles proper to a loyal Englishman and Christian, Hanway was fulfilling his duty as a religious subject, whose proved merit and position entitled him to speak with authority. If men continued to attack such work they must be chastised.

Some such blast Hanway published in the *Gazetteer* and, for the only time in his life, Johnson was moved to answer an attack in print. In his "Reply to a Paper in the *Gazetteer* of May 26, 1757," he repeated that he had stated the truth to the best of his knowledge. He had empiric proof that drinking tea was not particularly harmful. He had not overawed the children at the Foundling, for they had talked freely on other subjects. Nor had he any fear for his personal safety after having criticized, justly, a virtuous citizen who was "an important member of an important corporation; a man who . . . puts horses to his chariot,"²⁵ for he saw no reason to be more gentle in reviewing Hanway's book than he would in discussing that of anyone else, even a "royal manifesto." Johnson reiterated that the book was ungrammatical, full of exaggerations and very dull.

There the controversy rested. Hanway continued, with little hope of success, to discourage the use of tea, and Johnson continued to consume his habitual quantity. Johnson observed in conversation that "Jonas acquired some reputation by travelling abroad, but lost it all by travelling at home."²⁶ Hanway concluded that, "If it had been my fortune to enjoy a greater share of WIT and a less portion of COURAGE, I should hardly have encountered so formidable an enemy with such great alliances, being so little supported as I am."²⁷ Hanway's statement is perhaps more just than Johnson's, but neither man believed that virtuous men should continue a quarrel. Their disagreement, ironically, has given Hanway more reputation than his own books.

The widespread use of gin and other spirits troubled Hanway almost as much as the drinking of tea. Most men of his

²⁵ *Works*, II, 406.

²⁶ James Boswell, *Life of Dr. Samuel Johnson*, ed. G. B. Hill (New York 1891), II, 140.

²⁷ Hanway, "Essay on Tea," *Let.* IV, 217.

time drank heavily of gin and whisky, as well as of wine and beer. The use of gin was so destructive to the health and industry of the poor that many efforts were made to restrain its manufacture and its sale, both by levying high taxes to increase the price and by restrictions on taverns. When the more rigid Acts were enforced, public health immediately improved, but these were repealed or were nullified by the distillers and by smugglers. The latter, Hanway estimated, defrauded the Government of almost a million pounds in annual revenues.²⁸ Men estimated that there was an ale-house or tavern for every hundred people in the country and that a man could buy enough gin to become drunk for a penny. In the 'fifties Hanway had agreed with John Fielding that public houses should be abolished :

At the ale-house the idle meet to game and quarrel; here the gamblers form their stratagems; here the pick-pockets hide themselves till dusk, and gangs of thieves form their plots and routs; here conspirators contrive their hellish devices; and here the combinations of journeymen are made to execute their silly schemes.²⁹

Jonathan Wild had frequented taverns to select both his victims and his agents. While heated by wine Captain Booth lost his few remaining guineas at play and then contracted an embarrassing debt,³⁰ a story common in actual life. The English were inveterate gamblers, whether contributing to the support of armies by national lotteries or rolling dice with the grocer, "double or quits," for the day's supplies. Because Beau Nash had bet that he could, a man ran himself to death to make the journey from Bath to London and back within a specified time: whereupon Nash took up a collection at the Rooms for the benefit of the widow. Because they were illegal and the members rigorously punished, labour unions could only be successful where the men of one trade frequented the same tavern and enforced their own discipline. Employers agreed sometimes with barmen to pay wages in the

²⁸ *New Year's Gift*, *passim*.

²⁹ Fielding, *An Account of the Origins and Effects of a Police*, x.

³⁰ *Amelia*.

ale-house, and the workmen would frequently spend most of their income before leaving the premises.

Although Hanway recognized that these houses contributed to most of England's crime he concluded by 1767 that the houses might be regulated but not abolished. For all its evil, liquor was a manufacture from grain and a link in foreign trade;³¹ if the English did not provide it for those who insisted upon drinking, the French would smuggle increased quantities and the country would lose gold, silver and trade.

To illustrate the poverty, dissipation and idleness caused by taverns, Hanway cited the experience of an unnamed town in Scotland. Up to the time when it issued three licences this town had required no Poor's Rate, for no one was in need. Within thirty months the citizens were assessed at eighteen shillings in the pound for the support of the indigent, and the licences were withdrawn. Hanway thought that a law should be passed for all ale-houses to close at nine o'clock at night, taverns at eleven, and that no licence should be granted for one in a cellar.³² He also reminded the wealthy that their gambling in homes and at White's led to imitation among the poor, whose gambling in homes and taverns destroyed that sober industry and piety which was necessary for wealth and safety. Because the poor followed the customs of the rich, these should maintain an exemplary morality.

Not only should the wealthy teach by example but they should exert positive pressure on the poor, on servants and on everyone they knew in order to improve public health. The little Hanway knew about sanitation and ventilation he constantly repeated. He advised Parliament to conduct an inquiry into the merits of inoculation against smallpox, for he was sure that the benefit of making this prevention compulsory would thus be established. Meanwhile he thought that work-houses should refuse to admit paupers until they brought a certificate that they had been treated, and that no household servant should be employed without a testimonial of inoculation. According to statistics 16,000 persons in England had

³¹ *Letters on the Rising Generation*, II, 107.

³² *The Citizen's Monitor*, 24.

smallpox during a year. The disease was fatal to one-seventh (one-fifth among the poor) of those attacked, but only one in two hundred died from inoculation. Since those being treated could spread the contagion, a separate house for them might be established in each district. Mr. Bramble commented favourably on inoculation in a letter to Dr. Lewis,³³ and Sir Launcelot Greaves listened to the story of the broken-hearted Clewlines' moral degeneration after their son had succumbed to the disease. Hanway reproved the doctors for having more interest in their purses than in saving lives, for the people would adopt many measures to improve public health if properly urged.

As Hanway considered measures necessary to reform the poor and to make them honest, industrious men and women he became convinced that the whole relationship of master and servant needed revision. In London alone three thousand servants were ordinarily out of employment and thus composed a small army which was always ready to make life miserable for others, either by cruel stratagems such as those practised upon Roderick Random and the faithful Strap, or by rioting with Wilkes and Lord Gordon. Furthermore, those who were employed were almost equally disorderly because, like the precious rascal employed by Joseph Surface or those satirized in *High Life Below Stairs*, they imitated the fashionable vices of their betters. If masters did not maintain a rigorous discipline and instruct their household in the duties of religion, Hanway thought that they placed their dignity, advancement and happiness in the control of inferiors. To illustrate the common danger, he repeated stories of the insolence of servants in extorting vails from guests and in punishing their superiors who failed to submit. He wrote solemnly that certain servants had placed a beef-bone in the great-coat pocket of one penurious guest who had been lamed before discovering it. In the servant quarters of many houses the domestics posted scathing comment on persons visiting their master. At the departure of any guest they all lined up to receive a gratuity, and gentlemen (among whom was Han-

³³ *Humphry Clinker*, Bath, April 23rd.

way) sometimes refused invitations because they could not afford the vails, or told a servant to keep a pair of gloves because they were not worth the shilling it cost to redeem them.

Sir Timothy had dined with the Duke of N—— and on his leaving the house, was contributing to the support and insolence of the train of servants who lined the hall; and at last put a crown into the hand of the Cook, who returned it, saying, "Sir, I do not take silver." "Don't you, indeed," said the worthy Baronet, putting it in his pocket, "then I do not give gold."³⁴

In applying for a place menials discussed the amount of entertaining done in the house so that mistress and servant might better estimate the "wages" to be received, and servants refused to work in retired households. Even the business of the master was second to the collection of vails, for menials would report that the head of the house was "out" or "busy" until they received money.³⁵ Readers of *Roderick Random* would expect the Scot to be greeted unpleasantly at the house of Mr. Cringer, M.P. until the servant had been bribed; they understood that he must give his last shilling to the scrubwoman after he had received his licence at the Navy Office. When Samuel Johnson waited angrily while Chesterfield saw inconsequential people the great Lord may have been unaware that the prospective lexicographer was near, for the servants may have seen only an uncleanly hack from Grub Street who had not paid the usual fee. In private houses servants provided the cards for play; therefore guests left money to cover their cost plus a gratuity. To quote Hanway, vails had "unhinged all domestic intercourse, wounded the authority of masters, created an impatience of control, and sown the seeds of contempt of superiors."³⁶

³⁴ Pugh, *Life*, 184.

³⁵ Hanway, *Eight Letters to His Grace Duke of ——, on the Custom of Vails-Giving in England. Shewing the Absurdity, Inconvenience, National Disreputation, and Many Pernicious Consequences of it to All Ranks of the People* (1760), hereafter referred to as *Eight Letters on Vails-Giving*; also *The Sentiments and Advice of Thomas Trueman, a Virtuous and Understanding Footman* (1760), hereafter referred to as *Thomas Trueman on Vails*.

³⁶ *Reflections, Essays and Meditations*, 49.

Yet Hanway knew that the servants could not be blamed for making the most of their opportunities. As a candidate for election Matthew Mug stressed the desirable features of the place he had secured for the son of Fourth Mob :

4th Mob. And is it a pretty goodish berth, Master Mug?

Mug. The best in the world; head-butler to Lady Barbara Bounce.

4th Mob. A lady!

Mug. The wages are not much, but the vails are amazing.

4th Mob. Barbara Bunch.

Mug. Yes, she has routs on Tuesdays and Sundays, and he gathers the tables; only he finds candles, cards, coffee and tea.

4th Mob. Is Lady Barbara's work pretty tight?

Mug. As good as a sinecure; he only writes cards to her company and dresses his mistress's hair.

4th Mob. Hair! Zounds, why Jack was bred to dressing of horses.³⁷

On the stage this was good fun, but other authors portrayed current problems more realistically. When Joseph Andrews lost his place and servant's livery in defending his virtue he had to borrow an outfit to cover his nakedness. Humphry Clinker's prospects as a postillion were endangered because Miss Tabitha regarded the gaps in his rags as indecent exposure and a personal affront. The men who built work-houses, by providing separate quarters for decayed house-keepers and faithful servants, recognized that the sturdy Strap and Corporal Trim would doubtless spend their old age at the charge of the parish. When Uncle Toby in his gentle affection secured the Corporal's future, everyone present sympathized with the servant's gratitude: "Trim attempted to thank my uncle Toby—but had not the power—tears trickled down his cheeks faster than he could wipe them off—He laid his hands upon his breast—made a bow to the ground, and shut the door."³⁸ Mr. Shandy's coachman paid Uncle Toby a very great compliment in saying that he would sooner

³⁷ *The Mayor of Garratt.*

³⁸ *Tristram Shandy*, Book IV, Ch. IV.

"drive such a gentleman for seven pounds a year—than some for eight." ³⁹

To correct an evil which injured both master and man Hanway repeatedly advised his readers to pay their servants a proper wage and then to insist that duties be performed faithfully without gratuities. He addressed a pamphlet to servants on the indignity of beseeching or accepting vails. The model English servant, Thomas Trueman,⁴⁰ was grateful that he worked for a master who paid just wages, urged religious tracts upon his household, held daily prayers morning and evening, and explained the duties of life and religion in a manner suited to their lesser understandings. When servants joined the chairmen in throwing mud at Hanway because of his umbrella they may have remembered that he was the leader of an unpopular crusade.

Fashionable men and women of the day preferred servants who were not encumbered with wife and children, a preference Hanway thought conducive to immorality and instability among menials, besides being selfish and unpatriotic. Although England needed a greater population, 10,000 of London's 25,000 pairs of servants were unmarried. The women were eager to have husbands, but the men knew that a wife was a permanent hostage to fortune. Hanway compared this situation with that in America, where living was cheap and a wife and children were an advantage. There the population doubled every twenty-five years. If Englishmen assisted married servants they would reduce the general disorder and be able, furthermore, within a half century to muster the progeny into an army of 20,000 fighting men. Meanwhile, if servants were properly guided, both they and their children would be profitable to the country; menials would "submit to terms, and acquiesce in their children being early trained to industrious pursuits, whereby they might be prevented from being any encumbrance on the community." ⁴¹ Hanway thought that it was scandalous for fashionable

³⁹ Book V, Ch. VIII.

⁴⁰ *Thomas Trueman on Vails*.

⁴¹ *Letters on the Rising Generation*, I, 158.

society to place obstacles in the way of marriage. Servants should be told, rather, that those who "decline wedlock without good reason, do so far plunge a dagger into the breast of their common parent, their country, that they cut off the means of supplying her armies and navies hereafter."⁴²

Like other men of his age Hanway was not only eager to increase the number of inhabitants, but he was also continually searching for a means of preventing any of these from becoming dependent upon public support. He advised all responsible people to make sure that all children were trained from infancy to be frugal and industrious. He pointed out to the public the great advantage of teaching everyone to knit and spin, because at this trade even the blind could earn part of their support. Under Elizabeth one person in a thousand wore stockings; under George I one in five hundred; by 1800 almost no one was without them.⁴³ Hanway recommended that the poor be forced to learn knitting before they could be granted a settlement in any parish. If by law the poor must demonstrate that they could knit a pair of stockings worth one shilling or spin the equivalent in five days, each would have an earning power of almost twopence-halfpenny per day. Since many people were independent on this sum, only the infant and the infirm would require parish relief. Perhaps Hanway had read Moll Flanders' tearful protestations at the age of eight that, since she could earn threepence daily at spinning and fourpence at plain sewing, she should be allowed to maintain herself as a gentlewoman and not be apprenticed.

In his *Serious Considerations on the Parish Poor* (1762) Hanway proposed that each parish appoint a salaried District Visitor, a suggestion people were not yet ready to adopt. Hanway, however, thought that the parish could administer relief more sensibly and its people remain independent if such an officer was employed. The parish should know the business at which the poor laboured, the state of their health and

⁴² Hanway, *The Soldier's Faithful Friend: Being Moral and Religious Advice to Soldiers; with an Historical Abridgement of the Events of the Last War* (1776), 8; hereafter referred to as *The Soldier's Faithful Friend*.

⁴³ Hammond, *Rise of Modern Industry*, 210.

morality, the kinds of houses in which they lived, and the diseases which they had or to which they were particularly subject. If the Visitor was empowered to disburse small sums among worthy people who were in distress these might be enabled to keep free of the workhouse; they would be encouraged by this proof that society sympathized with their distress and recognized their virtue. While Hanway was sure that this measure would remove much of the current discontent, he evidently realized that his proposal would not be adopted by his generation, for he dropped the discussion.

By 1770 over fifteen hundred children every year owed their lives to Hanway and to his practical industry in the Foundling, the workhouses and the Marine Society. Because he had already done so much for children he was naturally sympathetic to the plight of those poor waifs who had been apprenticed as chimney sweepers. The masters of these lads were very poor themselves, and competition in the trade was so keen that they were forced to charge rates which allowed them to do almost nothing at all for their helpers, even as to supplying them food and shelter. The masters were so notorious that even the workhouses refused to apprentice small boys to them (by 1785 only one workhouse would do so); they recruited from the poorest people who sold their infants at five to seven years of age for from twenty to thirty shillings. Some of the worst masters, taking as many as thirty helpers, depended for their livelihood not only on their own casual business but also upon renting these boys out to other men. After four or five o'clock in the morning Londoners commonly saw these waifs calling in the streets for business, dressed in tatters, without shoes or stockings, and with large sores on their eyes and bodies from going unwashed for weeks at a time. Blake included a poem on their misery in *Songs of Innocence* and another in *Songs of Experience*; Lamb's essay included their gamin laughter as one of the unpredictable pleasures of London streets.

Readers of Hanway's *State of Chimney Sweepers' Young Apprentices* (1773) or his *Sentimental History of Chimney Sweepers* (1785) would not begrudge the lads a hearty laugh

even if it was occasioned by a nasty fall such as the one Lamb reported, for the sweeps had more frequent cause for recourse to tears. For example, Hanway described one twelve-year-old he knew. This boy, having been apprenticed at five, had now served his time; his legs and feet were shaped like the letter S, he had once been blind for six months and still had sore eyes. Crippled as he was, no master would accept him for another apprenticeship. His health had not heretofore interfered with his work, for he could discard his crutches and use his hands and knees in a chimney. At the age of twelve he was three feet and seven inches tall, knew the Lord's Prayer and the Creed, and had heard mention of the Commandments.⁴⁴ Because no master would employ him the ladies of his parish were lending their assistance, and the boy seemed cheerful. Hanway also observed that householders frequently waited to call a sweeper until the flue was actually on fire, at which time the lad would be forced through an aperture scarcely as wide as his body to climb a chimney lined with jagged stones. Hanway gave as a common sight the example of a weeping boy who was "forced up, and did the business; but not without the flesh of his back being much bruised and part of the skin torn off."⁴⁵

In 1770 Hanway secured the aid of David Porter, one of the better masters of chimney sweeps, to form a "friendly society" among the employers for the benefit of the boys. The meetings of this society soon became so disorderly that Porter recommended that the group disband, for the masters saw no benefit to themselves in regulations which had been proposed. In 1773, therefore, Hanway formed a Committee of Merchants as a means of bringing pressure to bear upon those who were least humane. This committee wrote a letter to all masters calling attention to the duties each owed to his helpers and recommending legal indentures. The indentures stamp, however, cost five shillings, which masters regarded as a useless expense, and only a dozen or so were officially bound.⁴⁶ In December of the same year the committee wrote

⁴⁴ *A Sentimental History of Chimney Sweepers* (1785), 77-81.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 85.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 64-70.

a second letter in which they threatened to appeal for an Act of Parliament to regulate the numbers who might be employed. The weavers of Spitalfields had just secured such intervention, not to protect apprentices but to protect journeymen from the unrestricted competition of "free" apprentice labour. For a short time after this letter was sent the masters improved.⁴⁷ In 1788 Parliament passed an Act (28 George III, c. 48) to regulate the trade, but the masters evaded its few provisions and abuses continued as before.⁴⁸

In his books on these apprentices Hanway argued that the masters could incorporate some changes in their business which would benefit the boys without injury to themselves. He maintained that if the charge was increased from sixpence to a shilling the boys could be furnished with proper bedding, laundry, clothes and food, and that all masters ought to allow each boy wages for three years after his apprenticeship or to settle him in another trade. An apprenticed youth was meant to receive instruction in a trade at which he could earn his livelihood, but in chimney-sweeping he outgrew the trade during his years of service. The small boys could be saved from personal injury if they were never required to climb a chimney which was actually on fire, and if narrow chimneys, having projecting stones, were swept with brushwood, dragged through on the end of a chain. Hanway believed that the abuses in the trade were as unnecessary as they were inhumane.

Granting that these suggestions had no effect Keeling observed that they now have a special interest to readers in that they show the transition from medieval to modern ideas of regulation.⁴⁹ The "Company" had always set minimum wages and limited the number of apprentices, sometimes by Acts of Parliament; but the laws were always promulgated for the protection of adult workmen. Hanway was invoking the aid of the magistrates and statutory legislation to protect children from exploitation by the masters. That was new.

⁴⁷ Frederic Keeling, *Child Labour in the United Kingdom* (1914), 4.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 4-7.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 5.

Because he had a wide reputation for philanthropic activities Hanway often received pleas for assistance both from the indigent themselves and from those attempting to organize societies. One such letter he printed in his *Sentimental History of Chimney Sweepers*. A clergyman of London had asked for his help in establishing Sunday Schools on the model of those which had proved successful at Gloucester and elsewhere. Hanway at first refused, for in 1785 he was at last "a storm-beaten ancient man" who was "inclined to rest." In publishing his refusal he stated that the project was worthy and, as other men would undoubtedly contribute both their time and their money the clergyman should have little difficulty in founding his society. Later in the year Hanway's attitude changed, and he gave advice on ways to co-ordinate the work of the various schools so that each should learn from the others and all be more efficient. Hanway's last book, *A Comprehensive View of Sunday Schools* (1786), was an attempt to explain the value of this education to the public and to present lists of words and moral fables for use by the teachers.

Hanway must have seen that the Sunday Schools were almost ideal for carrying on the most important features of his own work. To him the physical relief administered was not so valuable as either re-establishing good order or, especially, creating Christians submissive to the will of God and working toward the Kingdom of Heaven.

Now the Church hierarchy had, he thought, erred greatly in reproving Wesley for taking religion out of the churches to the people. While Methodism swept the country like a flame, Hanway observed that scarcely one in two or three hundred persons among the labouring classes regularly took the Sacrament in the Established Church.⁵⁰ To men like Hanway, basing their religion on "reason" and "submission to duty," Methodism was positively repugnant. As a manner of worship these men thought Methodism's reliance on "feeling"

⁵⁰ Hanway, *Earnest Advice, Particularly to Persons Who Live in an Habitual Neglect of our Lord's Supper* (1778) and *The Importance of our Lord's Supper* (1782).

was insulting, if not blasphemous, to God; they shuddered at the hysteria and "enthusiasm" of Methodist services. Furthermore, quite apart from questions of propriety and form in worship men like Hanway regarded Methodism as a menace to the State. The Established Church taught obedience to the Government and to the Crown, but Hanway reported that when he had talked to a Methodist of subordination to superiors as being necessary to good government the Methodist had replied, "We must obey God, not man." What the Methodists called inspiration Hanway thought was delusion.⁵¹ At any moment the followers of Wesley or Whitefield might wreck all that English society had created.

Perhaps Hanway's reactions may best be shown from his account of Mr. W[hitefield's?] service at Tottenham Court. Although the poetry in the hymns was poor Hanway thought the prayers and the singing were very good. But the sermon!

When he begun his sermon the oddness of some of his conceits, his manner, and turn of expression, had I not been in a place of public worship, would have excited my laughter. As he went on I became serious, then astonished, and at length confounded, and consequently you may think in a most proper disposition to enter the list of the brotherhood.

But my confusion arose from a mixture of sorrow and indignation that any man, bearing the name of a minister of our meek and blessed Redeemer, or the dignity of the Christian priesthood, should demean himself like an inhabitant of Bedlam. I thought I saw human nature in distress, as much as in the cells of lunatics; with this difference, that he was permitted to go abroad and make others as mad as himself, which he might be able to accomplish by means of the credulity of his audience, joined to the art of making them think that himself and his fraternity are the only people in their senses.⁵²

Hanway was certain that there were some extremely good, well-meaning people among the Methodists. He would not, however, conceal his opinion of the sect on their account:

⁵¹ *Reflections, Essays, and Meditations*, II, 548-72.

⁵² *Ibid.*, II, 544-5.

I love an honest man, whether he be a Methodist, or a papist, a Jew, or a Mohamedan; but I wish they were all true Christians; and I would have no man pretend to be what he is not, or insult the world with such pretensions.⁵³

In the 'fifties and 'sixties Hanway was almost certain that there was no benefit in teaching the poor to write, and he was very doubtful that either they or the country would be benefited by their learning to read. In his latter years he saw that the poor were learning to read anyway; those like Winifred Jenkins⁵⁴ bought horn-books to instruct their fellows. Hanway had seen exciting novels lying on servants' dressing tables, books in which a turbulent hero overcame all opposition or a beautiful Pamela married a wealthy squire. Sixteen million newspapers were distributed every year, and the poor followed Wilkes and Gordon in vociferous idolatry. Hanway thought that the poor would be better subjects and better Christians if they were taught to spell out their Bibles and pious tracts in Sunday Schools conducted by the Church of England. These schools, furthermore, should teach children to avoid all literature and discussion which excited their passions, for these were not only a waste of time but conducive to immorality.

Because the poor could own very few books Hanway wrote *Virtue in Humble Life* (1774) to supplant the cheap novels, to counteract *Pamela*, and to provide better entertainment and instruction. In this volume Mary Trueman learned the "duties of life and religion" from a series of conversations with her father Thomas.⁵⁵ Because Hanway meant to depict an average English girl, he explained that Mary

... is not elevated with the hopes of riding in her coach, nor taught how to inveigle a young master, but reminded of the advantages of being honest and pious, agreeable to her mistress, and perchance of being one day married to a laborious honest man. To avoid the extremes of an undue

⁵³ *Reflections, Essays, and Meditations*, I, 13.

⁵⁴ *Humphry Clinker*.

⁵⁵ In 1770 Hanway had published *Advice from Farmer Trueman to his Daughter Mary, upon her Going to Service*, and it was these didactic discourses which he revised into the conversations of *Virtue in Humble Life*.

encouragement in promoting the indigent above their proper rank, she is left to her own discretion: If she observes the rules prescribed by her father she cannot fail of being happy.⁵⁶

Hanway wanted the poor to enjoy reading his book, for it would teach them ethics and morality. Writing carefully and revising each conversation he thought when the book was published that he had again achieved the literary excellence which men had admired in his *Account of the British Trade*, and asked his friends to praise the book in the magazines. Mrs. Montagu, "Queen of the Blues," wrote to her daughter that she had been greatly embarrassed by this request and that, while she liked Hanway and thought that his motives were excellent, she could not endanger her own reputation by applauding a book which she thought was both dull and badly written. *Virtue in Humble Life*, however, did much to fulfil its author's hopes. Not only was it widely read in the British Isles, but its shortened version, *Domestic Happiness Promoted* (1786) was translated into German and Dutch, Hanway's only book to be thus honoured.

The literary masterpieces of the eighteenth century were composed for men and women who read easily and rapidly, and had many hours which they could devote to entertainment. These people had never been poverty-stricken, and their most immediate concern with those who were centred, first, on maintaining order and, secondly, on keeping them self-supporting so that taxes might not increase. A book like *Oliver Twist* might not then have been understood, much less approved, by the reading public. As the novelists continued to appeal to their audience with such characters as Tom Jones, Humphry Clinker and Tristram Shandy, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu objected that the lives of these people were too insignificant to deserve so much attention. Yet even then Fielding dropped his angry sarcasm at Colley Cibber ("how strongly doth he inculcate an absolute submission to our superiors"),⁵⁷ perhaps from fear that *Joseph Andrews* might

⁵⁶ *Virtue in Humble Life*, I, xxxvi.

⁵⁷ *Joseph Andrews*, Book I, Ch. I.

anger the poor and prove to be a more dangerous book than the *Apology*. After "sentiment" had become popular and the public had read almost innumerable volumes designed to arouse their sympathy and to explain the purposes of charitable societies, men and women delighted in the novels of Charles Dickens. With neither his genius nor his understanding of an individual character, the writers of pious tracts had prepared the reading public to accept his work.

The worthy poor needed all the encouragement that could be given. An indirect way of holding them steadfast was to show that the way of the transgressor was harder than theirs, proof of which Hanway was eager to present.

CHAPTER VII

THE STURDY BEGGAR

LIKE every public-spirited man of his age Hanway saw that the London police were practically ineffectual in protecting society against those who preyed upon their fellows. Because he had been successful in other reforms Hanway turned his attention to this problem in the belief that his suggestions would prove equally sound both in arranging punishment which would deter men from crime and in rehabilitating felons. The country needed the best efforts of all its inhabitants, and Hanway always believed that men could be made to realize that the good way of life was preferable to the evil. Indefatigably and sensibly he investigated courts, jails, justices and keepers in order to determine what measures had already been proposed or attempted and to see why the system had heretofore failed to achieve its purposes. As usual he acquainted others with his findings, publishing *Observations on the Causes of the Dissoluteness* (1772), *The Defects of Police* (1775), *Solitude in Imprisonment* (1776), *Distributive Justice and Mercy* (1781), *Observations, Moral and Political* (1784) and *The Neglect of the Effectual Separation of Prisoners and the Want of Good Order and Religious Economy in Our Prisons* (1784), besides various comments introduced into other volumes.

At the beginning of the century Englishmen generally had believed that the sturdy beggars and criminals roving over country roads or in the streets and alleys of London must be rigorously punished. Defoe argued that whatever the lot of the beggar and thief might be, it was much too good for him and that the laws should be more stern than they were. Defoe reported that beggars within ten miles of London ate more white bread than all the people of Scotland, and assumed that the weak tolerance of the public increased both the number of criminals and the number of offences. Swift stated that shopkeepers who allowed mendicants to swarm before

their doors, stealing from merchants and begging from customers, deserved all that they suffered, for they knew that "a 'prentice with a horse whip" could "lash every beggar" away.¹

If a man escaped from the scene of his crime, there was little that the injured person could then do. To discourage criminals, therefore, the punishments meted out to those captured were severe. Furthermore, many crimes were subject to the death penalty because there were inadequate facilities for holding prisoners for long terms. Before 1688 less than fifty crimes were punishable by death. Sixty-three other offences became capital under George II; and in 1770 Blackstone estimated the total number at one hundred and sixty.² As late as 1784 Hanway commented that while the law allowed justices to set terms of imprisonment ranging up to three years, sheer lack of room forced the courts to acquit, hang, or transport most offenders.³ Even if a Jonathan Wild went to jail, he was likely to die. Prison fever sometimes wiped out inmates and officers, a justice or the Lord Mayor himself.⁴ Meanwhile crime steadily increased.

While men felt that crime in general should be punished severely a jury was likely to yield to sympathy and acquit an individual when conviction meant death. Also, because most men accepted the belief that Fielding's Court at Bow Street was the only incorrupt one in London the more experienced criminals played upon the natural suspicion of the jury to win their own acquittal. When Roderick Random was robbed in a bawdy-house the woman in charge had him arrested for disturbing the peace, and officers warned him that he must compromise with his remaining money or stay in jail, for she shared her income with the justice.

Or would you the frown of the Justice prevent,
He too has this palpable failing,
The perquisite softens him into consent,
The guinea is always prevailing.⁵

¹ *Proposal for Giving Badges to Beggars.*

² Lecky, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, VI, 246.

³ *New Year's Gift*, 19-21.

⁴ *Serious Considerations on the Parish Poor*, 28.

⁵ *The Bow Street Opera.*

A Mr. Selwin was amused at the cheerful impudence of a man condemned in Newgate who had discovered that no man possessing two hundred pounds had ever been hanged there; he too was freed.⁶ In 1749 a group of armed pickpockets and thieves stormed the Gatehouse to rescue a thief who had been arrested. In 1772 two men were whipped around Covent Garden, "one for stealing a bunch of radishes, the other for debauching and polluting his own niece."⁷ With constant examples of the extremes of justice—or injustice—before them, people would not support the administration of the law. Criminals aroused no sympathy and the nation was not disturbed by Johnson's estimate that one prisoner in four died every year; nevertheless the penal system cried out for revision.

Oglethorpe had investigated the state of the jails a generation before Howard, Bentham and Hanway attempted to introduce their reforms, but these latter owed more of such success as they achieved to the novelists and to artists like Hogarth than they did to the "projector" of Georgia. Henry Fielding, Tobias Smollett and others wrote from their own experience and observation to reveal the vagaries of justice and the penal code. The pattern of a novel often included a trip by the hero to Newgate, either as a prisoner or as the friend of one suffering injustice. In spite of the fact that their admirable characters may sometimes express sentiments which seem harsh to-day, the authors were then trying to establish attitudes which were more humane than those of the ordinary reader of their books. Sir Launcelot Greaves found that malefactors were too kindly used, and innocent persons had succumbed to the complete demoralization of the lowest inmates. Dr. Primrose brought religious comfort to men and women hungering for redemption. Booth discovered that Blear-eyed Moll regarded his decency as weakness in a place where thief preyed upon thief, and as he walked about the prison yard, he saw that those who might have been rehabilitated had become hopeless. *The Fool of Quality*

⁶ Boswell, *Life of Dr. Samuel Johnson*, III, 189, n. 3.

⁷ Lecky, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, VI, 247.

demonstrated that prisoners were eager for a little practical humanity which would enable them to become self-respecting and independent.

Novels of the period constantly remark upon miscarriage of justice. Parson Adams and Fanny were arrested as robbers on the accusation of the real thief, whom the parson had just beaten for attempting rape; the thief got away by bribing a constable, and Parson Adams and Fanny might have escaped while their captors were arguing about the prospective reward. With many clergymen Lady Booby would have succeeded in stopping the marriage of Joseph Andrews and Fanny by invoking the laws on vagrancy; she succeeded in having both sentenced to a month in Bridewell for cutting a twig while walking through a field. They were freed by Lady Booby's brother, not by the law. Sir Launcelot Greaves found a country justice ruining the community in order to enrich himself; and Sir Launcelot was later committed to a mad-house for attempting to protect his beloved. Booth was sent to jail in order that a peer might try to seduce Amelia, and Colonel James refused him bail for that reason; but when Booth's servant stole Amelia's few belongings, the captain discovered that if a menial purloined goods to the value of thirty-nine shillings, the law protected the servant from being accused of crime or being legally punished. Though she regretted his recovery, the court freed Miss Matthews when the man she had attempted to murder failed to die. She and Booth had made themselves comfortable, the bailiff informing them, "The best of all things are to be had here for money, both eatable and drinkable; though I say it, I shan't turn my back to any of the taverns for eatables or wine."⁸ He allowed the two to share a private apartment on payment of half a guinea, "the price of a bagnio." At another time, after Booth had been freed and then returned to jail, the bailiff scurried about seeking new debts for which his prisoner might be held if friends brought the money Booth was expecting.

⁸ *Amelia*, Book II, Ch. IX.

His desire was no more than to accumulate bail bonds; for the bailiff was reckoned an honest and good sort of man in his way, and had no more malice against the bodies in his custody than a butcher hath to those in his; and as the latter, when he takes his knife in hand, hath no idea but of the joints into which he is to cut the carcass; so the former, when he handles his writ, hath no other design but to cut out the body into as many bail bonds as possible.⁹

And after this consideration the bailiff was angry that Booth should refuse to distribute vails at his release. People who read contemporary novels and the daily newspapers were eager for common-sense reform.

To men like Hanway reform seemed more urgent because the country needed the labour these men might perform and the children which they might rear. At best England lost the services of a transported felon during his sentence. If he stayed in the colonies after the time decreed, his potential value was gone; if he returned before the time set, the country gained a criminal. According to Hanway's estimate eight thousand, five hundred and four grown persons had been shipped to the colonies between 1749 and 1772. He pointed out that if a man averaged working from the age of eighteen to thirty-eight at an annual worth to the community of ten pounds, this transportation had cost the country more than one and one-half million pounds. Again, when one contractor had averaged sending four hundred and seventy-three convicts from the Thames annually for a period of seven years, that contractor had disposed of a battalion of three thousand, three hundred and eleven potential soldiers of the king.¹⁰ While being transported, prisoners allowed on deck to prevent suffocation in the crowded hold had been known to capture the ship, sail it back to port, and scatter "like a cloud of pestilential locusts"—an occurrence Hanway thought "so shocking to common sense that if the event were not notorious beyond concealment, it would be an indecency to

⁹ *Amelia*, Book VIII, Ch. I.

¹⁰ *Distributive Justice and Mercy* (1781), 12-18.

mention it.”¹¹ Why not keep these men at home and fit them into the pattern of English living?

To make the system of law enforcement effectual Hanway stressed the necessity of having salaried officers who would not be allowed to prey upon those in their charge. A paid jailer should guard prisoners in lodgings provided by the State, no inmate being allowed to supply or to receive further comforts. The police of the city should be divided into four groups, each under a justice receiving from five to six hundred pounds per year. A justice should be assisted by four sub-justices, at salaries of four hundred pounds, each commanding a force of two head constables and six ordinary policemen. These were to supersede those decrepit old men “armed only with a pole, which some of them are scarce able to lift.”¹² To aid these officers in the execution of their duty Hanway believed that gentlemen would gladly form companies of volunteer police guards, so that a city of seven hundred thousand inhabitants need no longer be subject to riot, fire and pillage such as it endured from Lord Gordon and his mob.¹³

Hanway expected police officers to prevent vagrancy and begging, deplorable nuisances, likely to breed children to thievery and prostitution. Men and women who feigned illness or lameness should be whipped and put to hard labour. Women who attracted sympathetic alms by holding babies at their breast should be sequestered even if the public had to support both mother and child. Some parishes had been negligent in allowing those nurses who cared for the poor to rent out infants to beggars at fourpence a night; then mendicants maimed and mutilated babies in order that these might excite greater pity from passers-by. In 1771 officers scourged a woman for decoying children from their parents, blinding them, and employing them as beggars.¹⁴ To rid the streets of able-bodied loafers and ruffians Hanway recommended sen-

¹¹ Hanway, *Neglect of the Effectual Separation of Prisoners and the Want of Good Order and Religious Oeconomy in our Prisons* (1784), 9-10; hereafter referred to as *Neglect of Separation*.

¹² *Amelia*, Book I, Ch. II.

¹³ *The Citizen's Monitor*, xiv-xv.

¹⁴ Lecky, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, III, 138.

tencing them to one or two especially prepared workhouses where their lives could be regimented at hard labour.¹⁵ After a few underwent this rigorous punishment, others would be frightened into orderly work. Relatives of some beggars might be forced by law or by custom to support their indigent kin, and some vagrants themselves were able to give security that they would reform. Beggars existed, argued Hanway, because they had never been both rigorously and consistently punished.

While Hanway believed firmly in the rights of property as Locke had explained them and had no sympathy with a man who borrowed money which he could not or would not repay, he recommended that the laws on debt be revised to exclude those who could not possibly furnish the sums demanded and whose families suffered privation by the breadwinner's imprisonment. When a debtor was jailed he was thrown into the common prison-yard with murderers, thieves, pickpockets, prostitutes, and criminals of every degree from whom he could receive a thorough education in law-breaking; at the same time his family frequently went to the workhouse to be supported by the parish or his children became harlots and thieves. Where the man had been unable to pay when arrested, he was now held from any employment whereby he could earn his freedom. Who could possibly benefit from punishing a man who had intended no fraud?

Hanway had never heard a keeper say that he thought prisons were effectual either in reforming the inmates or in deterring citizens from crime. Sir John Fielding told Howard that prisons educated men so that, when they were released and found that their former comrades had been hanged, each became head of his own gang. Since most of those arrested were freed after a time, the jails had only succeeded in further endangering and degrading society. Practically, the problem was to find punishments which would strike terror to those who were tempted and would reform those who had been convicted.

Now no felon was likely to reform while he had access to

¹⁵ *Abstract for County Naval Free Schools*, xlii-xvii.

a tap-room and listened to harlots and thieves bragging of their former exploits or planning new feats upon their release. Hanway's friend, Dr. Dodd, awaited execution for the crime of forgery in a private apartment which had all available comforts, but he heard such continual blasphemy around him that he had difficulty in composing his soul for death. After reading Hanway's plan to ameliorate prison conditions Dr. Dodd sent for him to urge that these efforts be continued.¹⁶

First, Hanway believed that every prisoner should be held in a separate cell, where he would see only the keeper who brought him his food and a clergyman who came daily to remind him of the beautiful life after death, the reward of those who had fitted themselves for it in this world, and of the eternal, hopeless horrors which he would suffer if he was damned. To these exhortations the jailer would add pious tracts in which further arguments were presented and the duties of religion fully explained. Sentences were to be indefinite and the prisoner released only when his adviser became convinced that his religious conversion was permanent and his industry assured.

During incarceration everyone should be forced to work regularly at his own trade. The goods that he manufactured should be sold by the State, but the proceeds should be given to the labourer in order that each might turn his attention from plans of robbery to those of protecting his own property. Through this scheme felons would benefit the public by their work; at the same time "the principle of self-love" would bring about moral regeneration. During their days in prison

. . . they will learn that religion and hopes in a life to come depend in a great measure on manual labour; that their distresses arose from their ignorance of such things as they are now learning in relation to a future state; and that idleness, dissoluteness, and the bad company which they kept brought them to seek resources in works of darkness.¹⁷

¹⁶ *Distributive Justice and Mercy*, 34.

¹⁷ *Neglect of Separation*, 53-4.

By this education the dregs of society would become valued members of the community.

To get official data for the use of legislators and philanthropists Hanway suggested the procedure which had proved successful in reforming the workhouses. He recommended that Parliament conduct an investigation into prison accounts for the past two years in order to discover :

1. The dimensions of the rooms and the uses to which they were put.
2. The average number received into each room.
3. The greatest number at any one time.
4. The greatest number sick at any one time.
5. The number who had died in prison.
6. The provision for changing garments and the frequency of change.
7. The provision for bathing.
8. The regulations on diet.
9. The regulations on strong drink.
10. The quartering of prisoners with respect to the quality of their crimes.
11. The number committed suspected of felony.
12. The number acquitted for lack of evidence.
13. The number pardoned.
14. The number hanged.
15. The proportion of taxes spent on prisons.
16. The method of clergymen in conducting public worship and private discourse.¹⁸

Hanway believed that this proposed investigation would prove that neither the present prisons, nor transportation, nor mercy had achieved the purposes of society. The Government would then be moved to consider other plans and to follow the one which seemed most likely to succeed.

After 1776 the Government was forced to revise its method of banishing criminals, for the American Colonies were closed to them. Prisoners were for a time confined in floating hulks anchored in the Thames. Here one hundred and thirty-two of four hundred and fifty men guarded in a single vessel died

¹⁸ *The Citizen's Monitor*, 211.

during one year, for they brought with them the infections of the jails.¹⁹ In 1780 Parliament adopted plans for the New Newgate, including both a tap-room and a common prison-yard. Following an investigation extending from 1784 to 1786 Parliament decided to establish a new penal colony in Australia and to build a number of new prisons in England. Hanway objected that while these jails were to provide solitary confinement for the inmates at night, the plans implied that men and women would work together during the day.²⁰ If they were allowed to associate at any time, he did not believe that any reform would be achieved. While men like Hanway, Howard and Bentham did much to improve prison administration, at the end of the century visitors were still in danger both from disease and from assault by inmates of the prison-yard.

At executions Hanway believed those officiating should restrain the holiday spirit of the mob. Men taking part in the affair should dress in mourning and stress the awfulness of their task in order to impress the crowd. Afterward clergymen, sheriffs and constables should see the body interred and prevent its being handled by the curious, for, "The indecent parade of throwing about a human body is shocking even to barbarians, except when they mean to cut it up and eat it."²¹ Contemporary exhibitions aroused the blood lust of mobs to such an extent that they had not infrequently committed acts of atrocious brutality.

Good citizens of eighteenth century England had reason to be perturbed over the impulses and habits of potential and active criminals. Men like Hanway, seeing that they dared not be indifferent to this life around them and that repressive measures were ineffectual, investigated current methods and noted suggestions for improvement. It remained for Dickens to popularize a reform instituted by Hanway, Howard, Bentham, and Mrs. Fry.

¹⁹ *Distributive Justice and Mercy*, 138.

²⁰ *New Year's Gift*, 14.

²¹ *The Citizen's Monitor*, 244-6.

CHAPTER VIII

THE CITIZEN OF LONDON

WHEN Hanway returned to London in 1750 he was a successful merchant. He believed that England could assume world leadership only if worthy men and women accepted their responsibilities and laboured for the common good, that men like himself, having proved their ability, should employ their common sense and experience to direct the lives of their fellow citizens toward plans and principles which would lead the nation to higher attainments. And, characteristically, he proceeded to act upon this conviction.

In 1754 John Spranger published his *Proposal or Plan for an Act of Parliament for the Better Paving, Lighting and Cleansing the Streets, Lanes, Courts and Alleys*. Pugh tells us that, "It is not easy to convey to a person who had not seen the streets of this metropolis before they were uniformly paved, a tolerable idea of their inconvenience and unseemliness,"¹ and this may explain why Hanway hastened to print his approval of Spranger's common-sense suggestions. Remembering conditions which he had observed in foreign cities and thinking that London might profit by his advice, he wrote *A Letter to Mr. John Spranger on his Excellent Proposal for Paving, Cleansing and Lighting the Streets* the same year.

When George I came up the Thames to ascend the throne of England he thought that the usual lights of the city were so bright that people must be celebrating his arrival. The pamphlets of Spranger and Hanway, however, reveal a London which could have been bright and clean only in comparison to the cities of Europe. The general care of the streets seems to have changed little since the time of Elizabeth. When the obliging Monsieur Du Bois slipped while carrying Madame Duval across a street that was ankle-deep in mud, the angry lady reported that "the more we tried to get up,

¹ Pugh, *Life*, 129.

the more deeper we got covered with the nastiness.”² As she surveyed her ruined garments Captain Mirvan whooped at her discomfiture—much as the lackeys had done after inveigling Roderick Random into a position where he must be soaked by mud splashed from a passing coach. Matthew Bramble wrote mournfully to his friend Dr. Lewis that in London,

Human excrement is the least offensive part of the concrete, which is composed of all the drugs, minerals, and poisons used in mechanics and manufactures, enriched with the putrefying carcasses of beasts and men, and mixed with the scourings of all the wash tubs, kennels, and common sewers within the bills of mortality.³

Yet long before Brooke recommended it in *The Fool of Quality*, sober men of business had realized that by improving the means of transportation, “half the number of hands that perish through war and want, might be peacefully and plentifully employed in accomplishing this weal [building roads and canals] of mankind.”⁴ New industries could then supply manufactures which would do much to further civilization.

Spranger recommended that each parish be responsible for the streets within its boundaries and elect non-salaried commissioners to supervise the work of cleaning and making repairs. If these men were given power to charge householders for work which they had refused or neglected to do, the people of the parish would soon learn to obey recommendations as they were made. Each inhabitant could then be required to repair that half of the street in front of his home. The general cleanliness of the city would be improved if men swept the part for which they were responsible twice a week and the parish then arranged to have the collected refuse hauled away. Furthermore the commissioners should have power either to force the Water Company and other public utilities to replace streets torn up in repairing pipes or to do the work at the

² *Evelina*, Let. XVI.

³ *Humphry Clinker*, London, June 8th.

⁴ *The Fool of Quality*, 354.

expense of the company. (Neither proposal seemed practicable to the general public.)

At the time there were few or no pavements. Posts set at intervals in front of the houses formed safety zones in which pedestrians sought refuge from the coaches, wagons and drays. When Hanway stated that in Paris people were in such danger on the streets that no one of quality would walk, his readers knew that Londoners faced similar hazards. One of the sports of the time was to drive a coach rapidly through the streets or whirl it around corners, crushing the unwary under the wheels or against the wall of a house. Unable to catch some of the roisterers, Saunders Welch once drove his coach alongside the house of the most notorious, jerked the culprit from his bedroom to the roof of the coach, and hauled him stark naked to Bow Street. Spranger thought that pedestrians could best be guarded by taking away the posts and raising the "foot way" above the street level. Where this could be done, he suggested that the street itself be made convex instead of concave and the gutters placed along the sides rather than in the middle.

Whether the street had a foot way or a raised sidewalk, Spranger recommended that this space be paved with broad Purbeck stones or squares and that the street proper be covered with Thames ballast or gravel over good pebbles solidly based. The Purbeck stones or squares would be sufficient for those courts, alleys and places not open to carriages. If the parish then erected lamps on wooden pedestals along each side of the street, it could contract with certain men to light these at sunset and extinguish them at dawn. Hydrants might be placed in a few of the posts to protect the city from fire. On each corner house Spranger suggested that a stone be placed at a specified height with the name of the street printed in "fair black and visible letters." Like Roderick Random many Londoners found it impossible to find any particular house in a distant part of town. Spranger wrote that his proposed measures would render London streets both more serviceable and more pleasant.

As a whole Hanway approved the *Proposal or Plan* and in

his *Letter* praised Spranger for his civic efforts. Hanway had no faith, however, that pavements would do their work honestly if they were not supervised; therefore the commissioners should first require that the stones be of an even size and then make sure that these were really laid on a firm base. Even on those streets which were wide enough for gutters to be placed on the side Hanway feared that the cellar homes would be flooded and that coaches would fall through the rusted iron gratings. Because the streets were narrow the posts might prove necessary in protecting those who walked and at the same time leaving room for carriages to pass. Shopkeepers might be allowed to hang their signs on these posts if the parish insisted that each be hung firmly and not allowed to sway, creak and rattle. Signs dangerous to passers-by as well as ruined buildings which were the rendezvous of thieves should be repaired or destroyed by the commission.

Like Spranger Hanway thought that London should protect its streets by requiring that all carts have broad wheels, but he objected to Spranger's further proposal that these be drawn by as many as eight horses. If teamsters lightened their loads at the edge of town, the cart could then be drawn by three animals, and one vehicle might pass another. Granting that fellows on the wheels should be nine inches broad, Hanway proposed that the commissioners allow a strip of iron about two inches wide to be superimposed, because this would save the wear on the wagons and do little harm to the streets. An effort should be made to regulate London teamsters, for they frequently blocked a passage with their big drays or neglected to remove empty beer butts when they delivered new supplies. Sometimes wagoners placidly refused to move and forced gentlemen to turn their carriages into other streets. One object of any reform should be to assure all conveyances a free, open passage from one street to another.

If the streets were to be cleaned twice each week, the men employed to haul the refuse away should be responsible men who would fulfil their contracts. Hanway suggested that wagons should be covered when they became two-thirds full,

for the present open carts jolted out a quarter of the load on the way to the dump. At any time a coach or pedestrian might be plastered with cakes of dirt, "of which many have had a most filthy experience."

By Spranger's plan each tenant or landlord was to pay for the work in front of his house, but Hanway realized that many were too poor to meet any added demand. Since the owners of coaches and carriages were to benefit, why not tax them, especially in view of the fact that London supported far more vehicles than were necessary to their owners? To pay for the new streets he suggested a tax of fifty shillings on four-wheelers, twenty shillings on two-wheelers not for hire, and thirty shillings on stage coaches. In this way the householder might be relieved and the burden distributed.

The common sense of these suggestions seems so obvious that a modern reader might expect an Act to have been passed immediately. Many public-spirited citizens had presented similar proposals, but Parliament took no action until 1762. Turning the pages of the *Journals of the House of Commons* one is likely to be further surprised at this delay, for the increasing number of Acts to build roads, streets and canals in England reveals the country's growing wealth. The building of roads, of course, expedited trade.

After the Acts of 1762, 1763 and 1764 had passed, London streets gradually became more convenient and less dangerous. During the 'sixties there were the usual difficulties in getting the work completed, the usual complaints of excessive expense and tremendous profit, and the burden of debt and taxes. According to Pugh, Hanway followed the movement until he saw the important points in his *Letter* carried out and then turned to more urgent affairs. By 1771 Matthew Bramble wrote to Dr. Lewis:

It must be allowed, indeed, for the credit of the present age, that London and Westminster are much better paved and lighted than they were formerly. The new streets are spacious, regular, and airy, and the houses generally convenient.⁵

⁵ *Humphry Clinker*, London, May 29th.

These words contrasted with his other opinions of London, and represented high praise.

About the time that Hanway published his *Account of the British Trade*, and departed for a holiday on the Continent, another matter of national concern came to his attention. A Bill to naturalize the Jews was introduced in Parliament, although for centuries any measure to grant toleration or equality to the descendants of the twelve tribes had aroused bitter prejudice and recrimination. In the agitation of the 1750's pamphleteers once again published the struggle from the Crucifixion, through Hugh of Lincoln, to the current sharp practices of money-lenders and receivers of stolen goods. While some men believed that Jews born and living in England had acquired citizenship *ipso facto*, others reacted to their religious and economic scruples, and argued that because an English king had banished them, all returning Hebrews must go through the legal form of a special Act of naturalization by King and Parliament. To this the Jews seem to have agreed, because they applied for citizenship under Cromwell, William, Anne and George I. For the benefit of English trade Charles II had naturalized all persons engaged in the manufacture of linen and tapestry. In 1740 Parliament had also enacted a law that all persons who resided in the American Colonies, or had served two years in the navy, were citizens of England. Yet the majority of Jewish inhabitants were believed to have no legal right to residence.

In his *Account of the British Trade* Hanway expressed his approval of a Bill introduced in 1744 to admit Hebrews into the membership of the Turkey Company. The measure had been proposed at a time when people were demanding either that the company be abolished or that the charter be limited to allow more open commerce. Merchants complained that the organization assured high prices by restraining trade. Inasmuch as new members were admitted on payment of twenty pounds, Hanway thought the monopoly harmless. Nevertheless, while in Persia he had noted that the Near East trade employed ten French ships to one English, a proportion

his countrymen ought, if possible, to reverse. Jews controlled Asia and would prefer to deal with men of their own faith; therefore admitting these to the Turkey Company would automatically increase the demand for English goods. Although Hebrew brokers charged a fee of one per cent for their services, and would continue to sell to wealthy buyers of their own creed; Hanway thought the company would prevent Jews from acquiring such wealth as to monopolize the trade. He favoured granting them privileges which would benefit Englishmen.⁶

At no time, however, did he believe it proper or wise to accept people of alien beliefs as citizens of England, for this would be contrary to principles of religion, government and economics. After God had decreed that the descendants of the twelve tribes should have no homeland, Englishmen dared not offer them refuge or equality. Even though Christ had asked that their sins be forgiven, Hanway argued that "neither from the gospel, nor reason, nor fact are we led to believe that their crime, in a national light, was forgiven them, nor have we any authority to act towards them as if it was pardoned."⁷ If the country attempted to contravert a punishment set by God, were not the people making themselves liable for the same justice? Of all foreigners, these especially were "not entitled to naturalization for two plain reasons: the first is because they are Jews; the next is because they are not Christians."⁸ Not only did this Bill contradict the will of God, but it also ignored the first principle of English government. To all British subjects the vicegerent of the Almighty was the King, who was head of the Established Church. How could Parliament naturalize people who refused to accept the sovereignty of God the Son? Because Jews were not required to take the Sacrament, Hanway thought that any Act which granted citizenship to one of their faith should be repealed.⁹

⁶ *Account of the British Trade*, II, 63-70.

⁷ Hanway, *A Review of the Proposed Naturalization of the Jews* (1753), 32; hereafter referred to as *Proposed Naturalization*.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *Ibid.*, 62.

If this Bill was passed, Hanway expected the economic effects both at home and abroad to be ruinous to many solid achievements of his countrymen. Believing that there were few wealthy Hebrews in England whose money might benefit English trade, he thought the most probable result of the Act would be to make England a haven of refuge for the foreign poor, who would flock from their ghettos to enjoy the benefits of English government. In London Hanway assumed that they would turn naturally to stock-jobbing and prey upon the honest and unwary.¹⁰ When individuals among them acquired fortunes they would purchase country estates in an attempt to establish social prestige. If these new-comers then arrogated to themselves the position and privileges of landed gentry, Hanway believed the result would be calamitous. As landed gentry the Hebrews would affect the thinking of peasants, and Hanway shuddered at the thought of sturdy workmen having to look to such persons as models of life and religion, for Jews hated to work and they had no art.¹¹ Furthermore, when the rural districts became thus corrupted, London would once more be affected, because the most influential merchants and men of business developed from country boys who came to London to seek their fortunes. From Elizabethan times the landed gentry had apprenticed their younger sons in trade. Thus Henry Clinton (*The Fool of Quality*) became a powerful merchant; in the *Castle of Indolence* Thomson traced the birth of the Knight of Arts and Industry to the sturdy country squire who embraced Poverty.

Merchants engaged in foreign trade knew well that naturalizing Jews would be a damaging blow to their own prestige. Portugal, for example, was a valuable ally of the Government, and many men made fortunes trading with that country and its colonies. The Portuguese despised all Jews. Should Parliament accept and naturalize those whom foreign nations found despicable, trade with those nations would be handicapped; Hanway felt "morally certain" that Englishmen

¹⁰ *Proposed Naturalization*, 70.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

would "decline into a very contemptible reputation in Portugal."¹²

In brief, Hanway's position was that his country owed nothing to these outcasts; they might be granted a chilly tolerance only where they were useful to English trade. Having left their own land under the wrath of God, Jews deserved neither sympathy nor consideration in any other, and since granting citizenship was contrary to principles of English government and religion, it must not be allowed. Despite these fulminations, however, the Bill passed (26 George II, c. 26). That year (1753) readers of *Ferdinand Count Fathom* followed the young Count Melvil about London as he tried to borrow money to return to Presburg. Not even the prospect of extortionate interest moved any Englishman to his aid, but a Jewish moneylender wept in sympathy and lent him five hundred pounds on an unsecured note. Generally, however, most novelists agreed with Hanway that Hebrews preferred skulduggery to honest dealing and assumed that they should be presented as particularly unsavoury characters. At its next session Parliament repealed the Act—perhaps in some measure through the influence of Hanway's pamphlets.¹³ It is interesting to note, however, that during the intervening period no Jew took advantage of the opportunity to become a British subject.

Hanway never developed any sympathy or tolerance for Hebrews in London. If a person was a Jew, that was sufficient reason for Englishmen to beware of his activities. In 1784 he recommended that the police direct Jewish industry in order that the happiness of the Jews might be "promoted."¹⁴ If Londoners proved unwilling to establish a ghetto, the police should keep a register of each family and the employments at

¹² *Proposed Naturalization*, 87.

¹³ Hanway wrote four pamphlets on the naturalization of the Jews: *Reflections upon Naturalization, Corporations, and Companies; A Review of the Proposed Naturalization of the Jews; An Answer to the Appendix of a Pamphlet Entitled Reflections upon Naturalization; and Letters Admonitory and Argumentative from J. H—y, Merchant*. All four were published in 1753.

¹⁴ Hanway, *Neglect of Separation*, 47–9.

which the members worked. He advised Parliament to enact legislation making all Hebrews answerable for a crime committed by any one of their number and to forbid owning a melting pot for gold and silver without a special licence. Believing, like Dickens,¹⁵ that most receivers of stolen goods were Jews, Hanway urged that all members of that faith be guarded, for this would be a more effective measure in suppressing crime than employing watchmen to walk the streets.

The triumph of England's armed forces has always been a matter of concern to patriotic British subjects. Through such organizations as the Marine Society Hanway did all that he could to assist the soldiers and sailors. During the struggles he worked to quiet the fears of the public and to maintain the country's morale. When, in 1755, the rumour spread that the French were gathering a force at Brest in order to invade England, and when the States General refused to send the six thousand troops which had been promised for such a time of danger, the fears of the people rose to such an extent that they interfered with the progress of the war. To quiet the public Hanway published *Thoughts on the Duty of a Good Citizen with Regard to War and Invasion* (1756). In this volume he reminded people that Voltaire had said that the French had planned to invade England during the previous war, so there was every reason to expect an invasion now. The country should therefore plan for an emergency by recruiting and arming a militia. London alone could gather from sixty to a hundred thousand men who could be equipped to take the field at a moment's notice. Hanway estimated that there must be sixty thousand footmen employed within the city who could be enlisted at once, for any footman unwilling to fight for his master and his country ought to be discharged. Hanway's suggestions were practical. The threatened invasion did not, however, occur.

In 1759 George II gave a group of citizens special permission to form a Society for the Encouragement of British

¹⁵ Cf. *Oliver Twist*.

Troops, whose purpose was to relieve the suffering of the army in Germany. Hanway's *Account of the Society* (1759) advertised the patriotic motives of the organization and revealed a group of men through whom those who had money to contribute might aid the soldiers in their battles. The society collected six thousand pounds, most of which was spent on flannel waistcoats, shoes and stockings for the troops. The group set aside one thousand and three hundred pounds to assist the widows and orphans of soldiers who had been killed. The fund also furnished half the money to publish *The Soldier's Faithful Friend: Being Moral and Religious Advice to Soldiers* and *The Christian Officer*, tracts Hanway wrote at this time for distribution to the troops.

When fire at Montreal destroyed property valued at over eighty-seven thousand pounds Hanway appealed for money to aid the distressed Canadians in his *Motives for a Subscription for the Relief of the Sufferers by Fire at Montreal* (1765). After Hanway had published three editions of this volume in the one year, a subscription of eleven thousand and seven hundred pounds was pledged and ten thousand and eight hundred pounds were remitted in silver. The next year a fire at Bridge Town, Barbados, destroyed property valued at about one hundred thousand pounds. Hanway was active in collecting funds for these people, helping to raise fourteen thousand, eight hundred and eighty-six pounds to send to the committee there.

In his last years he also opened a subscription for the benefit of Negroes cast adrift in London. To prevent the assimilation of coloured persons the Treasury supplied Hanway's committee with money (as much as fourteen pounds per person) in order that the blacks might be settled in other lands. Perhaps many servants such as those employed by Samuel Johnson and Lady Mary Wortley Montagu were transported to more happy environments. These sums reveal that Hanway's sincerity, honesty, and practicality had led the public to support organizations of which he approved, because they knew that their money would be spent in a worthy cause and with little waste.

Although orderly government and wars against other nations were necessary they were also very costly. Hanway and other leading citizens were disturbed at the mounting national debt. As early as 1761 he published *Some General Considerations on the Fluctuations of the Public Funds* and warned the country of the danger in continued borrowing, even for such an emergency as the current war. Hanway suggested that Parliament should raise money for the next year of strife by a graduated tax on all houses, lands and personal property. He estimated that a levy of one per cent on the last two would supply the Government with about seven million, six hundred thousand pounds. His own recommendation for taxing houses was that after they had been divided into six classes the owners should pay a stated proportion of their rental value to the Government—e.g., the first class should pay a sum equal to the total rent and the sixth a sum equal to one-quarter of the rent. Although these collections would cause an immediate hardship, the final burden of the war would be easier than repaying principle and interest on borrowed money. Hanway offered this plan in hope rather than in confidence, because he recognized that as long as the public credit was good, people desired to gain as individuals from the interest they received on money lent to the nation.

Returning to the subject in 1767,¹⁶ Hanway seems to have been reasoning toward income tax and death duties as a means of making national income equal expenses. In his opinion a country was not wise in allowing a war debt to exist for more than five or six years after the struggle had been ended, nor was it wise in paying more than a sixth of the national revenue as interest on indebtedness. More than this proportion would destroy freedom, justice, credit and safety; therefore he was alarmed that at the time he was writing one-half the sum collected went for this purpose. The national debt was so large that Parliament must levy high taxes. These would not only sweep away earnings but, since the sums paid by the wealthy would revert to themselves through Government pay-

¹⁶ *Letters on the Rising Generation*, II, 232-3.

ments on the money borrowed, heavy taxes would also concentrate wealth in the hands of the few, and the real burden would fall on the middle and lower classes. To maintain an internal balance of power the Government must assess taxes which would affect real property.

As wealth concentrated in the hands of a few, Hanway believed that these would set a high price on land and then pay whatever was asked for produce. The poor, however, would not profit by this change but would suffer through lack of necessities. People could see that this privation had already begun; therefore the nation must pay its debts immediately in order to ease the burden of the poor. Moreover, since another war was likely to occur within the next ten or fifteen years, the nation should prepare its credit against future emergencies. With good public credit, the English might be so respected by their enemies that these would prefer peace to war.

In 1784, after the war which he foresaw, he proposed a tax on servants as a means of lowering the national debt.¹⁷ Here, he argued, the wealthy ought to petition for higher assessments, because repaying the loans was primarily for the benefit and security of property. The master and mistress, who paid for the privilege of employing menials, would really be assuring themselves that in the future their property rights would be respected and maintained. For Hanway's peace of mind, it was well that he could not know what sums would have to be collected in the next century, when the rates of which he complained would be regarded as trivial.

Hanway could never reconcile himself to the eighteenth century development of political parties. For a Tory or a Whig to support a measure because it had been proposed by one who proclaimed himself to be of the same party was to Hanway unreasonable if not immoral. Men ought to vote in accordance with their principles of right and wrong. Persons who were placed in government offices should never acquire their positions by obstructing the constituted authorities, nor

¹⁷ *New Year's Gift*, 181.

should individuals be rewarded for having convinced the voters that those then in power were rascals. This rewarded the evil and belittled the virtuous. Men who cast ballots as their party leaders directed were encouraging a democratic tyranny which was worse than arbitrary power. The objects of leaders should be to get government business properly done, and to give young men experience which would enable them to progress in authority as they proved their ability and good sense. The country as a whole should reveal its stern disapproval of persons who obstructed measures only because their party was "in opposition." "The more such persons are indulged, or the less resentment shown against them, the more importunate they become, and thus the evil may reign from generation to generation!"¹⁸ Hanway reflected that Englishmen had created their international prestige by quarrelling with foreign enemies; by their domestic contention they were now destroying a hard-won reputation. "Disunion becomes an immoral principle; it is the parent of envy, malice, ambition and almost every baneful passion."¹⁹

¹⁸ *Neglect of Separation*, 75.

¹⁹ *New Year's Gift*, 90.

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSION

IN 1783 Hanway's health declined to a point where he was no longer able to perform his duties at the Supply Office. When he announced his determination to resign, George III continued his full salary as a pension. Thereafter Hanway lived quietly, devoting his time to charity and to the better religious training of the people. The fact that his mind remained clear and active until death was a source of satisfaction to him.

In the summer of 1786 he suffered increasing pain from a disorder of the bladder. When, about the first of September, he was unable to leave his bed, he requested his physicians to speak frankly as to the gravity of his illness. They told him that he could not recover. At this information Hanway sent for his tradesmen and paid them their dues. Then he took leave of London friends, dictated letters to those elsewhere, and had the Sacrament administered to him.¹ To his surgeon he suggested that his body be opened after death if this would aid doctors in the diagnosis or treatment of others. Because he had conducted his life in preparation for death, he was now unafraid.

On the evening of September 4th, 1786 Hanway asked to be dressed in a fine ruffled shirt. Then he parted with the keys of his household, gave away certain personal trinkets, and requested that his will be read to him. The annuity from a mortgage of five thousand pounds was bequeathed to his brother William; the remainder of his estate, valued at about two thousand pounds, he distributed among his friends and those foundlings and Magdalens in whom he felt a particular interest.² Most of his pictures and the ornaments of his home were to go to his great-nephew, Hanway Hanway. To

¹ Pugh, *Life*, 210ff.

² The Will of Jonas Hanway, *Norfolk*, 478.

Mrs. Irwin of Berners Street he left all his folio books of prints and manuscripts "in remembrance of civilities from her childhood"; to George Peters all bound books titled "pamphlets, polices, religion"; and to the Marine Society whatever books Dr. Glasse should choose "toward forming a little library there." As Hanway listened to this disposition of his property he considered that he had ordered his affairs explicitly and justly. He made no changes.

And now he must devote some last thought to whether he had occupied his time in a manner which would win approval from that Judge whom he must soon face. During a long life he had earned his bread and guarded that property which had been entrusted to his care. More than that, he had advised others on their best means of doing likewise. The *Account of the British Trade* discussed the hazards and necessities of merchants in foreign business; various books and pamphlets had revealed ways for the nation and the individual to husband resources. After he had retired from the Russia Company he had devoted his time to those organizations making life more liveable for the people of London. He had worked valiantly to assist the Foundling Hospital in saving thousands of lives and to restore the good opinion with which it had been regarded. After the public had forced curtailment of its efforts, Hanway had brought about reform in the workhouses. By continually publishing the results of personal investigation he had enabled these institutions to reduce their death rate from sixty and four-fifths per cent between 1762 and 1766 to seven and one-half per cent between 1767 and 1773. Over the same two periods they had reduced the death rate of children under two years of age from seventy-four and one-half per cent to thirty-two per cent. He had lobbied two Acts through Parliament. The first, providing for a complete record of infants admitted into parish workhouses, was generally conceded to have saved over five hundred babies each year. The second freed youths from servitude at the age of twenty-one and obliged masters to supply food, clothes and training to their apprentices.

He had been a foundation Governor of the Marine Society

and of the Magdalen Hospital. By 1783 the Marine Society had clothed fourteen thousand and six hundred men for the navy in time of war; it had established twelve thousand boys in a profession where they could earn an honest livelihood, removed from the temptations to crime arising from dire poverty. In 1786 the Magdalen Hospital had records of two thousand four hundred and fifteen repentant prostitutes who had been accepted as worthy of aid; one thousand five hundred and seventy-one of these had been rehabilitated. As treasurer of the Misericordia Hospital Hanway had made a beginning toward the control of venereal disease. In his books on police and prisons he had educated the public to the necessity of measures which would assure better order to the city, with safety of life and property. Formerly one-fourth of the prisoners had died every year, but the jails were becoming more healthy and sanitary. Laws on debt were revised, as he had suggested, and punishments were brought more nearly into relation to the gravity of the crime.

As Hanway lay on his death-bed he could see the outlines of a broad humanitarian movement which would have been almost inconceivable in 1750. Surely he had done as much as anyone to arouse public interest in social welfare and to form the principles by which charity would be administered. Incomes were doubling and redoubling, and while men might not trouble themselves to investigate worthy causes, they could and did contribute money to those charities which proved to be wisely planned. They dared not be indifferent to the suffering and disorder around them. For the charitably inclined Hanway had written seventy books and pamphlets to reveal the misery, crime and injustice which made London life precarious. He would die, but his work would not, for in 1786 there was no limit to the number of charities which men could found or assist if they had strength and energy. Plans for new organizations appeared every day. The pamphlet shops sold thousands of appeals for mercy and aid, hundreds of men and women visited the wayward, the poor and the sick.

Since 1750 Hanway's own body had been half-sick, frail

and weak. At last he was a "storm-beaten, ancient man," who was "inclined to go to rest." Shortly after midnight on September 5th, 1786 he died.

All the work of Jonas Hanway was directed toward knitting the lives of Englishmen into one pattern. He attempted to build a cohesive people in which each respected the rights of the others, each laboured for the general as well as personal benefit, and all shared common ideals through worship of the same God. Perhaps because he was dull in company he lost prestige with people like Mrs. Piozzi, Johnson and Fanny Burney. As an individual he was soon forgotten, but his methods and work were more influential in succeeding generations than those of the writers of *belles lettres*.

The work which he had undertaken thirty years before was continued by hundreds of others, two of whom came to be reckoned among the most influential persons in England. Like Hanway, Wilberforce and Hannah More were aided and advised by the great merchant John Thornton. The first of these entered in his journal the year after Hanway's death, "God has chosen me to reform manners."³ In this mission he founded or was active in at least seventy charitable societies, became leader of the Low Church Evangelicals, and rose to power in the House of Commons. There were eight hundred editions of books or pamphlets by Hannah More; over two million copies of the *Cheap Repository* were distributed in its first year. From Hanway through Gladstone, the object of all this work was to stamp out social unrest, irreverence and wickedness, and to substitute the austere morality of the Victorians. Long before Victoria became queen, however, Hannah More joyfully inquired, "Where is the world into which we were born?" Thus the religion and philanthropy of Hanway and the Established Church moulded the life and thought of the Victorians.

³ Ford K. Brown, *Virginia Quarterly Review*, "Fathers of the Victorians," XII, 417.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- HANWAY, JONAS; Abstract of the Proposal for County Naval Free Schools to be built on Waste Lands, giving such Effectual Instructions to Poor Boys as may nurse them for the Sea Service, Teaching them also to cultivate the Earth, that they may learn to furnish their own food; and to spin, knit, weave, make shoes, etc. with a View to provide their own Raiment, while good Regulations & Discipline diffuse a moral and religious Oeconomy through the Lande—in four Letters. 1783.
- An Account of the Hospital for the Maintenance and Education of Exposed and Deserted Young Children, Including the Charter, Act of Parliament, By-Laws, and Regulations, and annual Accounts of all Receipts and Payments, from the Commencement of the Corporation, on the 17th Day of October, 1739, to the 31st Day of December, 1758. By Order of the Governors of the said Hospital. 1759.
- An Account of the Marine Society, Recommending the Piety and Policy of the Institution, and pointing out the Advantages accruing to the Nation. With the Motives for Establishing It. Also a full detail of their Rules and Forms of Business. With a List of the Subscribers, from the Commencement in July 1756, to September 30th, 1759. Also a Proposal for accommodating the Boys, equipped by them, in the Merchants Service, when the War is finished. The sixth Edition. 1759.
- An Account of the Misericordia Hospital for the Cure of indigent Persons, involved in the Miseries occasioned by promiscuous Commerce. With Moral and Religious Advice to the Patients. Also the Rules and Orders for the Government of the Institution; with a List of the Governors. Likewise the Hymn sung on Occasion of the Anniversary of this Charity. 1780.
- Account of the Society for the Encouragement of British Troops (1760); Addressed to Mr. George Hanway Blackburn, on Occasion of his Baptism on the Fifteenth of February 1782. By one of his Godfathers, Jonas Hanway, Esq. when he was aged LXXI and IX months. 1784.
- Advice from Farmer Trueman to his Daughter Mary, upon her going to Service; in a series of Discourses, Designed to promote the welfare and true Interest of Servants: with Reflections of no less Importance to Masters and Mistresses. 1800.
- An Answer to the Appendix of a Pamphlet entitled Reflexions upon Naturalization, Corporations, and Companies, etc. Relating to the Levant Trade and Turkey Company, as this Subject is occasionally mentioned in Hanway's Travels. By the Author of those Travels. 1753.
- A Candid Historical Account of the Hospital for the Reception of Exposed and Deserted Young Children; Representing the present Plan of it as productive of many Evils, and not adapted to the Genius and Happiness of this Nation. Shewing, on the other hand, The great Importance of the Establishment, if put under proper Regulations, as the most effectual Means of preserving the Lives of a great Number of such Infants as have perished within the Bills of

- Mortality. With a Proposal for carrying a New Design into Execution. To which is added, A Letter from a Country Gentleman to a Governor of the Hospital: Containing Many Observations relating to Foundlings born, educated, or employed, in the Country; collected from real Facts; with his Opinion concerning the Amendments necessary. 1759.
- Christian Knowledge made easy: with a Plain Account of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. To which are added, The Seaman's faithful Companion, with an Historical Account of the Late War. The whole calculated for the use of young Persons: And this Particular Book, adorned with Engravings, to render it the more acceptable to . . . to whom it is presented. [n.d.]
- The Christian Officer, Addressed to Officers in his Majesties Forces 1766; The Citizen's Monitor; Shewing the Necessity of a Salutary Police, executed by Resolute and Judicious Magistrates, Assisted by the pious labours of zealous Clergymen, For the Preservation of the Lives and Properties of the People, And the happy Existence of the State. With Observations on the late Tumults, the Merits of the Soldiery, and the London Volunteer Police Guard. In twenty-nine Letters. (A reprint of the 1775 Defects of Police. . .) 1780.
- The Commemorative Sacrifice of Our Lord's Supper considered as a Preservative against superstitious fears and Immoral Practices. Earnest Advice to persons who live in an habitual neglect of this means of grace and hope of felicity. Prayers suited to the general exigences of Christians and the particular circumstances of the British Nation. 1777.
- A Comprehensive View of Sunday Schools, for the Use of the more indigent Inhabitants of Cities, Town, and Villages, through England and Wales, with Reflections on the Causes of the Decay of our Morals and National Piety, and the Means of removing them: Also a Copious School Book, for the Use of Sunday Scholars, under the good care of Parents, Masters, and Mistresses. 1786.
- The Defects of Police the Cause of Immorality, and the continual Robberies committed, particularly in and about the Metropolis; with Various Proposals for Preventing Hanging and Transportation. Likewise for the establishment of Several Plans of Police on a permanent basis, with respect to common beggars; the regulation of paupers; the peaceful security of subjects; and the moral and political conduct of the people: Observations on the Rev. Mr. Hetherington's Charity; and the most probable means of relieving the blind. In Twenty-nine Letters to a Member of Parliament. 1775.
- Distributive Justice and Mercy: Shewing, that a temporary real Solitary Imprisonment of Convicts, supported by Religious Instruction, and well-regulated Labour, is essential to their well-being, and the Safety, Honour, and Reputation of the People. 1781.
- Domestic Happiness, promoted; in a Series of Discourses from a Father to his Daughter, on occasion of Her going into Service; Calculated to render Servants in general virtuous and happy: with Various Characters, Anecdotes, Fables and Reflections, suited to Masters and Mistresses of Families. Being for the most part adapted also to the Use of Sunday Schools, as Lectures to the Scholars, particularly Such as are going into Service; Abridged from Virtue in Humble Life. 1786.
- An Earnest Appeal for Mercy to the Children of the Poor, particularly those belonging to the Parishes within the Bills of Mortality,

- appointed by an Act of Parliament to be registered, Being a general reference to the deserving conduct of some Parish Officers, and the pernicious effects of the ignorance and ill judged parsimony of others. With some comparative Views of those Parishes and the Foundling Hospital; and Reasons for the necessity of such an hospital in these cities, to be maintained for certain purposes only, and under certain restrictions. Also a Proposal for the more effectual preserving the Parish Officers here, and in other great cities and manufacturing towns, and rendering the children of the poor in general pious, useful, and good subjects. 1766.
- Earnest Advice, Particularly to Persons who live in an habitual Neglect of Our Lord's Supper, considered as a commemorative Sacrifice inseparable from Christianity, and as a Preservative against superstitious Fears, and the immoral Practices, which deface the Glory of our Country, and darken our Prospects of a Life to come. In Forty-Nine Letters. 1778.
- Eight Letters to His Grace Duke of —, on the Custom of Vails-Giving in England. Shewing the Absurdity, Inconveniency, National Disreputation, and many pernicious Consequences of it to all Ranks of the People. With Proposals for an increase of Wages, and other Advantages to Domestic Servants. 1760.
- The Genuine Sentiments of an English Country gentleman, upon the Present Plan of the Foundling Hospital. In relation to The Danger of bringing children to London, or establishing more receiving hospitals in the country; with the disadvantages in point of liberty, increase, poor-laws, marriages, education, apprenticeship, etc. Also on the great national benefit arising from preserving the infant poor born in London, as a great acquisition of riches and strength to the nation. [n.d.]
- The Great Advantage of Eating Pure and Genuine Bread, comprehending the Heart of the Wheat, with All its Flour. Shewing how it may contribute to the Health and Profit of the People and the Increase of the Quantity of Bread, preserving Infants from the Grave, by destroying the Use of Alum, and the Ingredients to whiten our present Wheaten Bread: proposing to end the Contest amicably, by allowing, upon proper authority, a Farthing on a Quartern Loaf more than seems to be provided for by the present Act, with respect to the Proportion of 7d. for the standard, and 8d. for the wheaten Bread. Second Edition, with Additions. 1773.
- An Historical Account of the British Trade over the Caspian Sea: with a Journal of Travels from London through Russia into Persia; and back again through Russia, Germany and Holland. To which are added, The revolutions of Persia during the present century, with the particular history of the great usurper Nadir Kouli. 1753. 4 vols.
- The Importance of Our Lord's Supper, and the Dangerous Consequences of neglecting it. In Sixty-Eight Letters. 1782.
- Instructions, Religious and Prudential, to Apprentices, and Servants in General, Placed out by the Marine Society; Also Prayers suited to their various occasions: with an Historical Account of the glorious victories obtained by his Majesty's arms in the late war; and a list of the enemies' ships taken. To which last is prefixed, The Archbishop of Tuam's Essay toward making the knowledge of religion easy; and an Abstract of his plain account of the Sacrament. Printed for the Use of the Marine Society. 1763.
- A Journal of Eight Days Journey from Portsmouth to Kingston upon

- Thames; through Southampton, Wiltshire, etc. with Miscellaneous Thoughts, Moral and Religious; In a Series of Sixty-Four Letters: Addressed to two Ladies of the Partie. To which is added, An Essay on Tea, Considered as pernicious to Health, obstructing Industry, and impoverishing the Nation: With an Account of its Growth, and great Consumption in these Kingdoms. With Several Political Reflections; and Thoughts on Public Love. In Twenty-Five Letters to the same Ladies. By a Gentleman of the Partie. 1756.
- A Letter from a Member of the Marine Society. Shewing the Piety, Generosity, and Utility of their Design, with respect to the Sea-Service, at this Important Crisis. Addressed to All True Friends of Their Country. Fourth Edition, with several Additions. Also a List of the Society and their Subscriptions. 1757.
- Letters Admonitory and Argumentative from J. H—y, Merchant, to J. S—r, Merchant, in Reply to Particular Passages, and the General Argument, of a Pamphlet, entitled, Further Considerations on the Bill, etc. 1753.
- Letters on the Importance of the Rising Generation of the labouring part of our fellow-subjects; being an account of the miserable state of the infant parish poor; the great usefulness of the hospital for exposed and deserted young children properly restricted; the obligations of parochial officers; and an historical detail of the whole mortality of London and Westminster, from 1592 to this time. With political, moral, and religious observations on the education and instruction of the poor, marriage, and population. Reflections on the causes of the high price of provisions; the danger of the national debt, expensive living, and want of zeal for our common welfare. 1767. 2 vols.
- Letters to the guardians of the infant poor to be appointed by the act of last session of parliament; also to the Governors and Overseers of the Parish Poor; recommending concord, frugality, cleanliness, and industry, with such a pious, humane, resolute, and judicious conduct in the execution of their office, as may effectually answer the good purposes for which they are chosen, and more particularly in the preservation of infants. 1767.
- Letters written occasionally on the customs of foreign nations in regard to harlots: the lawless commerce of the sexes: the repentance of prostitutes; the great humanity and beneficial effects of the Magdalene Charity in London: and the absurd notions of the Methodists: with Prayers and Meditations on the most interesting circumstances and events of life. 1761.
- A Letter to Mr. John Spranger, on his excellent Proposal for Paving, cleansing, and lighting the Streets of Westminster, and the Parishes in Middlesex. 1754.
- Mindful the Signal. In Sixteen Letters to a Lady of Quality. 1779. 2 vols.
- A Morning's Thought on Test and Contest. [n.d.]
- Motives for the Establishment of the Marine Society. By a Merchant. 1757.
- Motives for a Subscription for the Relief of the Sufferers by Fire at Montreal (1765).
- The Neglect of the Effectual Separation of Prisoners, and the Want of Good Order and Religious Oeconomy in our Prisons, the chief Cause of the frequent Thefts and Violences committed, and the horrible Consequences attending them. In Fifteen Letters. 1784.

- A New Year's Gift to the People of Great Britain, pleading for the Necessity of a more vigorous and consistent Police; the Connexion of Public Happiness with Religion; and against the Danger of political Discord. With several Proposals Respecting Education and other Salutary Regulations. In Form of a Letter to a Friend. 1784.
- Observations on the Causes of the Dissoluteness which reigns among the lower Classes of the People; the Propensity of some to Petty Larceny: and the Danger of Gaming, Concubinage, and an excessive Fondness for Amusement in high life, etc. Also an Account of the Humanity and Policy of the Marine Society, now soliciting an Incorporation—The State of the London Workhouse, and the Usefulness and Piety of the Magdalen Hospital, etc. With a Proposal for new regulating of Bridewell, in order to render it of important Service to the Police of London. Likewise a Plan for preventing the extraordinary Mortality of the Children of the labouring Poor in London and Westminster. In three Letters to a Governor of Bridewell, Bethlem, Christ-Church, etc. 1772.
- Observations on a Proposal made by Edward King, Esq. to the Marine Society, for instructing and breeding up poor Boys to become Seamen, by means of a Ship-School, to be kept constantly at Sea, except when driven into Port by the Want of Provision, or Stress of Weather; as preferable to the Proposal Ascribed to Mr. Hanway, for a proper and fit house, with Eight Acres of Land adjoining, in order to furnish suitable active Employment for Boys, in Addition to moral and religious Instruction till placed out, as a *Preparative, and the most necessary judicious Means, of recommending Boys as Apprentices to good Masters, to serve by Land or Sea, as they can be best accommodated to get their Bread honestly. With Moral and Political Reflexions on the Cause and Effects of the Dissolute Manners which now prevail among such Numbers of the rising Generation. By a Member of the Marine Society. 1785.
- A Plan for establishing a Charity-House, or Charity-Houses, for the Reception of Repenting Prostitutes. To be called the Magdalen Charity. 1758.
- Proposal for County Naval Free Schools to be built on Waste Lands, giving such effectual Instructions to Poor Boys, as may nurse them for the Sea Service, teaching them also to cultivate the Earth, that in due time they may furnish their own food, and to spin, knit, weave, make shoes, etc. with a view to provide their own Raiment, while good Regulations and Discipline, diffuse a moral and religious Oeconomy through the Land. [n.d.]
- A Proposal for saving £70,000 to £150,000 to the Public; at the same time rendering 5,000 young persons of both sexes more happy in themselves and more useful to their country, than if so much money were expended on their account. 1764.
- Prudential, Moral, and Religious Advice. 1783.
- Reasons for an Augmentation of at least Twelve Thousand Mariners, to be employed in the Merchants-Service, and Coasting-Trade; with Some Thoughts on the Means of providing for a number of our Seamen, after the present War is finished; also to support a constant additional Marine-Force, in order to the cheaper and more expeditious decision of our future Quarrels; and to render Pressing necessary in a less degree. Also to promote the Benefit of Ship-Owners and Under-Writers; to extend the Navigation of these Kingdoms, and to take care of the Poor, who incline to a Sea-Life. Likewise to make Provision for the Boys fitted out by the Marine

- Society, when they shall be discharged from the King's-Ships. With some Remarks on the Magdalen-House. In Thirty-Three Letters to Charles Gray, Esq; of Colchester. 1759.
- Reflections, Essays and Meditations on Life and Religion, with a Collection of Proverbs in Alphabetical Order, and Twenty-Eight Letters written occasionally on several subjects, *viz.* The absurd notions of the sect called Methodists. The customs of foreign nations in regard to Harlots. The lawless commerce of the Sexes. The repentance of Prostitutes. And the great humanity and beneficence of the Magdalene Charity. 1761. 2 vols.
- Reflections on Mr. Hanway's Report to the General Court of the Marine Society, on the 21st of July, 1785, and the Resolutions thereon; Proving the Necessity of a Peace Establishment for instructing the poor and distressed Boys who are the Objects of it, on the true Principles of the Institution, and as a Means of giving it an honourable and permanent Existence; The Design Being equally practicable and correspondent with the general Wishes of the People for a Reform of our Police, the Promotion of true Piety, and the most useful Industry; With the Addition of learning the Duty of an Able Mariner, and a Worthy Man. [n.d.]
- Reflections upon Naturalization, Corporations, and Companies; Supported by the Authorities of both Ancient and Modern Writers. By a Country Gentleman. 1753.
- A Reply to C—— A—— Author of the Candid Remarks on Mr. Hanway's Candid Historical Account of the Foundling Hospital, with relation to the probable Advantages of this Institution, if confined to such Foundlings, Orphans, and Deserted Children, within the Bills of Mortality, as were usually sent to Parish Workhouses and Parish Nurses. 1760.
- A Review of the Proposed Naturalization of the Jews; being an Attempt at a dispassionate Enquiry into the present State of the Case, with some Reflexions on General Naturalization. By a Merchant who subscribed the Petition against the Naturalization of the Jews. 1753.
- The Rules and Orders of the Stepney Society, with an Account of the End and Design of this Benevolent and Political Institution; The Great Improvements it seems capable of to promote the most useful Industry, and Encourage Parents and Children in numerous poor and industrious Families: Also Moral and Prudential Instructions, Given to the Apprentices placed out to Marine Trades; with Thirty-Four Prayers Adapted to them: Likewise a List of the Stewards, From the Commencement in 1674, to 1760. 1759.
- Rules and Regulations of the Maritime School, on the Banks of the Thames, near London. Instituted in 1777. With a view to qualify Scholars to serve as Officers in the Royal Navy. Preferring the Sons of Sea Officers for the greater part. 1781. (Originally published in 1778 or 1779.)
- The Seaman's Faithful Companion. Being an abstract of religious and moral Advice addressed to Masters of Ships, in the Merchant Service, their Men and Apprentices. Also a few words to Officers and Seamen in the Royal Navy, with Prayers Suited to the Use of Seamen. [n.d.]
- A Sentimental History of Chimney Sweepers, in London and Westminster Shewing the Necessity of putting them under Regulations, to prevent the grossest Inhumanity to the Climbing Boys. With a Letter to a London Clergyman on Sunday Schools, calculated for the preservation of the Children of the Poor. 1785.

- The Sentiments and Advice of Thomas Trueman, a Virtuous and Understanding Footman: in a Letter to his Brother Jonathan, Setting forth the Custom of Vails-Giving, in a Candid and most interesting Point of View, with regard to the private and public Happiness which depends on this Practice. 1760.
- Serious Considerations on the Salutary Design of the Act of Parliament for a regular, uniform Register of the Parish-Poor in all the Parishes within the Bills of Mortality. In Two Letters Addressed to a Churchwarden. 1762.
- The Soldier's Faithful Friend: being moral and religious Advice to Soldiers: with an Historical Abridgement of the Events of the last War. To which are prefixed, Reflections on the Defections of the Colonists. Printed on occasion of the Benefaction for the Relief of Soldiers' Widows, etc. in America; London. 1776.
- Solitude in Imprisonment, with proper profitable Labour and a spare Diet, the most humane and effectual Means of bringing Malefactors, who have forfeited their Lives, or are subject to Transportation, to a right Sense of their Condition; with Proposals for Salutary Prevention: And how to qualify Offenders and Criminals for Happiness in both Worlds, and preserve the People, in the Enjoyment of the genuine Fruits of Liberty, and Freedom from Violence. 1776.
- Some General Considerations on the Fluctuations of the Public Funds. 1761.
- Songs, Hymns, and Psalms, Collected, Altered, or Composed; Adapted to Moral and Instructive Amusement, and the Religious Part of the Education of the Scholars of the County Naval Free Schools, Proposed for the Breeding Up of Poor Boys to Agriculture, and the theoretical Practice of Common Seamanship. 1783.
- Thoughts on the Duty of a good Citizen, with regard to War and Invasion; in a Letter from a Citizen to his Friend. 1756.
- Thoughts on the Plan for a Magdalen-House for Repentant Prostitutes, with the Several Reasons for such an Establishment; the Custom of other Nations with regard to such Penitents; and the Great Advantages which will probably arise from this Institution upon political and Religious Principles. Addressed to the Promoters of this Charity. 1758.
- Thoughts on the Use and Advantages of Music, and Other Amusements most in esteem in the polite world, and the means of improving them to make our proper happiness and our pleasures but one object. In Nine Letters. In answer to a letter relating to modern musical entertainments, etc. 1765.
- Three Letters on the Subject of the Marine Society. 1758.
- To the Marine Society, in praise of the Great and Good Work they have done by Clothing and Fitting out for the Sea-service 2,682 Men, and 1,868 Boys, in the Space of fifteen Months, to the 6th of October last, Recommending Constancy and Perseverance in the Cause they have espoused.
- To the Memory of Mr. George Peters, Junior, of St. Petersburg, Merchant. 1780.
- Virtue in Humble Life: containing Reflections on the reciprocal duties of the wealthy and indigent, the master and the servant: Thoughts on the various situations, passions, prejudices, and virtues of mankind, drawn from real characters: Fables Applicable to the Subjects: Anecdotes of the Living and the Dead: the result of long experience and observation. In a Dialogue between a father and his daughter, in rural scenes. A Manual of Devotion, comprehending extracts from eminent poets. 1774. 2 vols.

INDEX

- Addison, Joseph, i, 1, 17, 48
 Amelia, Princess, 18
 Anne, Queen of England, ix, x,
 17, 138, 140, 175
 Austen, Jane, xvii
- Bacon, Francis, Lord Verulam,
 25
 Bailey, William, 137
 Beauclerk, Lady Diana, 132
 Bedford, Duke of, 19
 Bentham, Jeremy, xv, 162, 169
 Berkeley, Bishop, xi
 Blackstone, Sir William, 161
 Blake, William, 152
 Blizzard, George, 102, 130
 Bosanquet, Mr., 5
 Boscawen, Admiral, 81, 83
 Boswell, James, 109, 132
 Brooke, Henry, 22, 171
 Brown, Martin, 46
 Brownrigg, Mrs., 57, 95
 Burn, Richard, x, xii
 Burney, Fanny, 10, 11, 129, 187
- Cadogan, Dr. William, 16, 23,
 24
 Carlyle, Thomas, 135
 Cary, John, xii
 Catherine, Empress of Russia, 3
 Cecil, William, 1st Lord Burgh-
 ley, x
 Charles II, King of England,
 175
 Chesterfield, Earl of, 123, 148
 Christ Church, Surrey (parish),
 58
 Cibber, Colley, 158
 Cibber, Theophilus, 85
 Clarke, Rev. Dr. Samuel, 1
 Colquhoun, Patrick, xv
 Conyers, Dr., 24, 25
 Coram, Thomas, xiv, 18, 19, 20
 Cromwell, Oliver, 175
 Cumberland, Duke of, 102
 Cumberland, Richard, 121
 Cust, Peregrine, 85, 102
- D'Arblay, Mme., see Burney,
 Fanny
 Defoe, Daniel, ix, xi, xii, xv,
 107, 121, 160, 179
 Dickens, Charles, x, 75, 159,
 169
 Dingley, Charles, 2, 8, 78, 79,
 114
 Dingley, Robert, 8, 111, 112,
 114
 Dodd, Rev. Dr. William, 167
 Dorrien, John, 114
 Drake, Sir Francis, 77, 107
- Eddridge, John, 52
 Eden, Sir Frederic Morton, x,
 70, 75
 Edmonds (a statistician), 26, 70
 Edwardes, Edward, 100
 Eliot, Sir Gilbert, 98
 Elton, Mr., 3
- Farr, Richard, 86
 Fenton, Lavinia, 121
 Fielding, Henry, ix, xiii, xviii,
 xix, xxi, 79, 87, 90, 110,
 138, 158, 162
 Fielding, Sir John, ix, xviii, 79,
 85, 95, 96-8, 100, 110, 111,
 112, 113, 118, 120, 131,
 145, 161, 166
 Finch, Lady Isabella, 18
 Finis, Kitty, 37
 Firman, Thomas, xii
 Fludyer, Sir Samuel, 114
 Fry, Mrs. Elizabeth, 169
- Gainsborough, Thomas, 100
 Garrick, David, 85, 110, 111
 Gay, John, 9
 George, Prince of Denmark, 102
 George I, King of England, 114,
 117, 151, 170, 175
 George II, King of England,
 xvii, 19, 81, 83, 85, 161,
 179
 George III, King of England,
 xvii, 132, 184
 Germaine, Lady Elizabeth, 5, 7
 Gilbert, Thomas, 75

- Gillingwater, Edmund, 121
 Glasse, Dr., 102, 185
 Goldsmith, Oliver, xvii, 122, 137
 Gordon, Lord George, xviii, 147, 157, 165
 Grant, Sir Alexander, 114
 Gwynne, Nell, 121
- Hale, Matthew, 72, 87
 Hamilton, Lady, 109
 Handel, G. F., 21
 Hanway, Elizabeth (sister of Jonas Hanway), 2, 5
 Hanway, Hanway (great-nephew), 184
 Hanway, Major John (uncle), 4
 Hanway, Thomas (father), 1, 7
 Hanway, Mrs. Thomas (mother), 1
 Hanway, Thomas (brother), 2, 7, 78
 Hanway, William (brother), 2, 184
 Hasky, Mr. (apothecary), 80
 Hawke, Lord, 102
 Hawkins, Sir John, 77, 107
 Hertford, Earl of, 114
 Hickes, Mr., 5, 98
 Hill, Peter, 52
 Hoare, Samuel, 7
 Hogarth, William, 21, 162
 Howard, John, 162, 166, 169
 Howe, Nurse, 62
 Hyde, Mr., 97
- Irwin, Mrs., 185
- James, Dr., 80
 Johnson, Dr. Samuel, xviii, 6, 7, 25, 55, 73, 83, 109, 111, 112, 132, 142-4, 148, 162, 180, 187
 Johnstone, Charles, xi, xviii
- Keeling, Frederick, 154
 Keith, Dr., 129
 King, Gregory, xv
- Lacy (Garrick's partner), 85
 Lamb, Charles, 152
 Lambeth, 58
 Lardner, Nathaniel, 116
 Lieberkyn, Dr., 5, 8
 Locke, John, xx, 1, 22, 35
- Macaulay, Thomas Babington, xviii
 Maidwell, Lewis, 102
 Maitland's *History of London*, 138
 Mann, Sir Thomas, xvi
 Mary Magdalen, 116
 Mead, Dr., 25
 Mendez, Mr., 85
 Miles, W. A., 110-11
 Millar, Andrew, 5
 Milton, John, 1
 Mingotti, Signora, 85
 Montagu, Mrs. Elizabeth, 11, 158
 Montagu, Lady Mary Wortley, 24, 113, 158, 180
 Moore, Mr., 139
 More, Hannah, 132, 187
- Nash, Beau, 145
 Nelson, Robert, xii, xiii, 17
 Nettleton, Robert, 114
 Newcastle, Duchess of, 7
 Newcastle, Duke of, 7, 148
- Oglethorpe, James, 83
 Otway, Thomas, 1
- Parkes, Anthony, 85
 "Pauperis, Philo," 67-9
 Pepys, Samuel, 77
 Persia, Shah of, 3
 Peters, George, 185
 Phillips, Mr., 53
 Piozzi, Hester Lynch Thrale, 187
 Poole, Nurse, 66
 Pope, Alexander, 1
 Porter, David, 153
 Preston, Thomas, 114
 Pugh, John, 1, 7, 14, 15, 102, 170, 174
- Reynolds, Sir Joshua, 21
 Rich, John, 85
 Richardson, Samuel, 67, 129
 Roebuck, Mr., 85
 Romney, Lord, 79, 114
 Rowe, Nicholas, 1
- St. Andrew above Bars, 58, 60, 62, 71
 St. Anne, Westminster, 58
 St. Botolph without Aldgate, 58

St. Clement Danes, 48-50, 66,
67-9
St. George, Bloomsbury, xix, 58,
64
St. George, Hanover Square, 58
St. George the Martyr, 58, 62,
71
St. George, Middlesex, 62-4
St. Giles-in-the-Fields, xviii, 58,
64
St. Giles without Cripplegate,
• 58
St. James, Westminster, 58
St. Luke, Middlesex, 57, 58, 62,
65
St. Margaret and St. John, 58
St. Martin-in-the-Fields, 32,
50-3, 57, 58, 60
St. Mary, Newington, 61
St. Mary, Whitechapel, 53, 62
St. Paul, Shadwell, 58
St. Saviour, Southwark, 58
Savage, Richard, 55
Savile, Sir George, 114
Secker, Archbishop, 7
Selwin, Mr., 162
Shadwell, Thomas, xviii
Shakespeare, William, 1, 116
Shippen, Dr., 54
Sloane, Sir Hans, 22, 23, 24
Smollett, Tobias, xi, 54, 67, 73,
87, 90, 117, 162
Somers, John, 1st Lord, xviii

Stafford, Richard, 84
Steele, Sir Richard, 17
Sterne, Lawrence, 67
Swift, Jonathan, ix, 160

Thomson, James, 177
Thornton, John, 5, 7, 79, 85,
100, 102, 107, 114, 187
Tillotson, John, Archbishop, 48
Townsend, Mr., 2
Tuam, Archbishop of, 88

Vere, Lady, 109
Victoria, Queen of England,
187
Voltaire, 179

Walpole, Horace, ix, xvi, 113
Watt, James, xix
Welch, Saunders, xix, 113, 172
Wesley, John, 67, 155
Whitefield, Rev. George, 156
Whitworth, Mr., 59
Wilberforce, William, 187
Wilkes, John, xviii, 127, 131,
147, 157
William III, King of England,
175
Winchelsea, Lord, 86
Wombwell, George, 114
Worledge, Captain, 2

Young, Arthur, xv, xvi.